DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 859 HE 019 224

TITLE	Quality Development in Higher Education to Meet the Future Needs of Arkansas. Report of the Quality Higher Education Study Committee.
INSTITUTION	Arkansas State Dept. of Higher Education, Little Rock.
PUB DATE	Oct 84
NOTE	95p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Arkansas Department of Higher Education, 1301 West Seventh Street, Little Rock, AR 72201-2993.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; Affirmative Action; Blue Ribbon Commissions; Budgets; *Change Strategies; College Faculty; *College Planning; Economic Factors; *Educational Quality; Financial Support; General Education; Governance; Higher Education; *Public Colleges; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; School Organization; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Arkansas

ABSTRACT

A report of the Quality Higher Education Study Committee on state-supported institutions in Arkansas is presented, including 43 recommendations. Attention is directed to: economic characteristics in the state (business indicators, population and growth, personal and family income); social characteristics in the state (education levels, illiteracy, college-going rates); needs identified by business and industry leaders; colleges' contribution in resolving business and societal problems; governance and structure of higher education; the relationship of colleges to vocational and technical schools; college admission; conditional admission and nontraditional students; retention of college students; general education curriculum; transfer of credits; accreditation; academic program review; teacher education; faculty preparation and qualifications; annual faculty evaluation; promotion and tenure; faculty and administrator's salaries; staff development; personnel turnover; faculty workload; affirmative action in employment and enrollment; the higher education budget process; libraries; research and public service; equipment and facilities; private gifts and grants; and auxiliary enterprise. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Arkansas Department of Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robert Cabe, Attorney
Allen, Cabe and Lester
Little Rock, AR

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Dr. Gary Chamberlin, Director
Ark. Department of Higher Education
Little Rock, AR

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Bill Baxter, President
Baxter Land Company
Dermott, AR

Ms. Mary Faye Black, Partner
J.B. Warmack Partnership, Limited
Waldo, AR

Dr. John Easley, President
Phillips County Community College
Helena, AR

Ms. Joan Farley, Teacher
Pocahontas Public Schools
Pocahontas, AR

Dr. Dan Ferritor, Chairman
Department of Sociology
University of Arkansas at Fayetteville
Fayetteville, AR

Ms. Sarah Fountain
Associate Professor of English
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR

Dr. Lloyd Hackley, Chancellor
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, AR

Dr. Fred Hattabaugh, Dean
School of Education
Henderson State University
Arkadelphia, AR

Mr. Al Hunter, Superintendent
Mountain Home Public Schools
Mountain Home, AR

Mr. Blake Lovette, President
Val-Mac Industries, Inc.
Russellville, AR

Ms. Myrtle Paige, Instructor
East Arkansas Community College
Forrest City, AR

Mr. Andrew Roshell, Teacher
Rison Public Schools
Rison, AR

Mr. Sandy Sanders, Manager of Govt. Relations and Training
Whirlpool Corporation
Fort Smith, AR

Mr. Paul Hill, Plant Manager
Monroe Auto Equipment Company
Paragould, AR

Dr. Henrietta Williams
Little Rock, AR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

QUALITY HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

October 1, 1984

The Honorable Clarence Bell, Co-Chairman
Joint Interim Committee on Education

The Honorable G. W. Turner, Co-Chairman
Joint Interim Committee on Education

Mr. James B. Blair, Chairman
State Board of Higher Education

Gentlemen:

In compliance with Act 8 of the First Extraordinary Session of the 1983 General Assembly, we hereby present to the Joint Interim Committee on Education and the State Board of Higher Education the final report of the Quality Higher Education Study Committee.

Following the publication of its preliminary report in July, the committee received a substantial amount of comment and reaction, both formal and informal, in writing and through meetings with individuals and groups. Many of the comments were in the nature of constructive criticism and have been of significant value to the committee in refining and clarifying many of its recommendations. The vast majority of the reactions communicated to the committee were positive and supportive of most, if not all, of the report.

While the task assigned to the committee by the General Assembly is complete, the committee encourages all who read and study this report to communicate their reactions to the committee through the Arkansas Department of Higher Education. Since the members of the committee have invested vast amounts of time and effort (and not insignificant amounts of money) in accumulating, assimilating, discussing, and acting upon a large quantity of information, they will continue to be interested in these matters and willing to further consider, modify or defend these proposals when appropriate.

The citizens of Arkansas stand today at the brink of an exciting new frontier of economic, social, and personal development. Public higher education, properly supported and encouraged, will be of immeasurable value in this effort. The courage and foresight of the General Assembly and the Governor in the last special session in providing additional funds and insisting on excellence and innovation is heartening; we hope this report will materially assist in maintaining the momentum for change and improved quality in education in Arkansas.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Cabe
Quality Higher Education
Study Committee

Gary D. Chamberlin, Secretary
Quality Higher Education
Study Committee

cc: The Honorable Bill Clinton, Governor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Presentation	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Creation and Procedure	1
General Observations and Principal Goals	2
Relationship to Other Groups and Committees	4
CHARACTERISTICS OF ARKANSAS AND HER PEOPLE	5
Economic Descriptors of the State	5
Business Indicators	5
Population and Growth	7
Personal and Family Income	8
Social Descriptors of the State	8
Education Levels	8
Illiteracy	9
College Going Rates	9
Projections of Economic and Social Needs of the Future	10
Needs Identified by Business and Industry Leaders	10
Changing Nature of Business	10
Increased Dependence on Higher Education	11
GOVERNANCE AND ORGANIZATION	12
Governance & Structure	12
Single Board Model	14
Two Board Model	15
Three Board Model	15
Multiple-Campus Regional Boards	15
Conclusions	16
The Number and Scope of Institutions	19
Graduate Institute of Technology	20
Relationship of Colleges to Vocational-Technical Schools	20
CURRICULUM AND STUDENTS	21
Admission of Students to Colleges and Universities	21
Conditional Admission and Non-Traditional Students	22
Retention of Students in Colleges and Universities	22
General Education Curriculum	24
Minimum Core	24
Minimum Course Content	25
Evaluation	26
Transfer of Credits	26
Accreditation	26
Academic Program Review	27
New Programs	28
Existing Programs	28
On-going Institutional Curricular Review	29
Teacher Education	30

Page

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION..... 32
Faculty Preparation and Qualifications..... 32
Annual Evaluation..... 33
Promotion..... 35
Tenure..... 36
Faculty and Administration Salaries..... 38
Faculty Salaries..... 38
Administration Salaries..... 38
Staff Development..... 40
Personnel Turnover..... 41
Faculty Workload..... 42
Part-Time Instruction and Graduate Assistants..... 43
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION..... 45
Employment..... 45
Faculty/Administrator Fellows..... 46
Arkansas Alumni Fellows..... 47
Enrollment..... 48

RESOURCES AND GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS..... 49
Higher Education as a Priority in State Financial Resources..... 49
Higher Education Budget Process..... 50
Management Responsibility and Flexibility..... 51
Libraries..... 53
Research and Public Service..... 54
Public Service..... 55
Creativity and Innovation..... 56
Equipment and Facilities..... 57
Private Gifts and Grants..... 58
Auxiliary Enterprises..... 59

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS..... 61

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS..... 63

APPENDIX A..... 85

QUALITY DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION TO MEET THE FUTURE NEEDS OF ARKANSAS

Report of the
Quality Higher Education Study Committee

INTRODUCTION

Creation and Procedure

The Quality Higher Education Study Committee (QHESC) was created by Act 8 adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly meeting in Extraordinary Session during October and November, 1983. The Committee consisted of a Chairman appointed by the Governor, the Director of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) serving as Secretary, and 15 members appointed by the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE). The membership was representative of higher education faculty and administration, secondary school faculty and administration, parents of college and university students, and the general public, and was broadly distributed throughout the state. The Committee was charged in Act 8 with the responsibility of preparing

> a thorough study of the overall quality of education being offered at the various state-supported institutions of higher education in the State. Such study shall include physical facilities, curricula, teacher qualifications, affirmative action programs, admissions requirements, and such other matters as the Committee may deem necessary or appropriate to enable the Committee to make an analysis of the quality of higher education at the various institutions and to make appropriate recommendations regarding changes which should be made to improve higher education and to make higher education more responsive to the needs of the State of Arkansas.

Since the charge of the QHESC was to study the state-supported institutions of higher education only, no reference is made to the independent colleges and universities. This omission stems from the charge of the QHESC, and in no way reflects negatively upon the regard which Arkansans hold for independent institutions or upon the contribution which they make to the education of the state's citizens.

The QHESC was requested to submit a preliminary report of findings and recommendations to the SBHE and the Joint Interim Committee on Education of the Arkansas General Assembly by July 1, 1984 and a final report by October 1, 1984.

The members of the QHESC were officially appointed during the month of December, 1983 and met for the first time on January 6, 1984. In addition to numerous meetings to develop recommendations as included herein, meetings were held with all of the presidents and chancellors of state-supported higher

education institutions and with business and industry representatives early in 1984. During April, 1984, twenty (20) public hearings were conducted throughout the state and several letters including suggestions were received and considered.

Formal presentations on the preliminary report were made to the State Board of Higher Education, the legislative Joint Interim Committee on Education, and the Governor. Numerous copies of the preliminary report were sent to members of the General Assembly, the state-supported and independent institutions, and other various interested parties. Further comments and suggestions were received and considered and the QHESC again met with the presidents and chancellors of state-supported institutions in September, 1984.

In developing recommendations, the Committee divided into three subcommittees in the general areas of: (1) Curriculum and Students, (2) Faculty and Administration, and (3) Resources and Governance. The remainder of this report reflects the collective thinking of the QHESC and is presented for consideration by the people of the State of Arkansas.

State-supported institutions of higher education in Arkansas include baccalaureate and graduate colleges and universities, and community colleges. The term "institution" and its derivatives will be used in this report to refer to all of them, unless otherwise qualified.

General Observations and Principal Goals

To achieve the ultimate goals of increased personal and family income, improved quality of life, and greater individual self-fulfillment and satisfaction, several things must happen.

At the outset, it must be recognized that higher education is a key element in the pursuit of these goals. Business, industry, and even government which can provide highly paid jobs will be attracted only where quality higher educational opportunities are available. The training and retraining of people for these positions are obviously major considerations, and it is in higher education that this training must be available and must take place.

As higher education mobilizes its forces in the battle to attract more and better students and to give them an education that is characterized by quality and relevance, two important points should remain paramount. First, the students need, now more than ever, a sound basic education in the traditional arts and sciences to give them the flexibility, adaptability, and skills of analysis and communication which will be of increasing importance during the rapidly changing circumstances taking place now and for the foreseeable future. Second, higher education in Arkansas should be directed toward our existing resources and some of the areas in which we already have substantial investments and commitments; in other words, we should build upon what we already have.

After spending many, many hours in review of data, in listening to and engaging in discussions with a long list of interested persons and groups, and in deliberations of subcommittees and the full committee, the QHESC is impressed with the many fine programs and qualified, dedicated faculty members at Arkansas

institutions. In fact, there is much that could be done by the institutions to advertise and promote the quality of their present offerings. However, for a variety of reasons, often tied to a lack of resources, there are significant improvements which have not been made but should be made. Also, there is often substantial variation in quality among institutions and programs.

As the end of this intensive process of study and discussion was approached, there were certain general ideas or goals which guided the thinking of the QHESC and which provided the backdrop for the recommendations at center stage. The following is a brief discussion of those matters:

1. While Arkansas is a state of limited financial resources. it is imperative that we, as a state, make the investment necessary to improve education at all levels, including the higher education system. This investment, however, should be directed to the improvement of quality pursuant to a specific plan and this report is submitted for that purpose.

2. We must break the cycle of low educational attainment and low income levels in Arkansas and increase the enthusiasm and appreciation of our people for greater educational achievement. Where a state's population has attained higher levels of education, its citizens generally enjoy a correspondingly higher standard of living.

3. There is a need for greater flexibility of management and administration at our institutions, and a corresponding need for improved indices of achievement, quality, and excellence. In order for Arkansas institutions to be competitive and attract the quality of faculty and administrators needed to insure excellence in educational offerings, the boards and administrators of the institutions need increased flexibility in setting salaries and freedom from unnecessary and ineffective bureaucratic requirements with respect to purchasing and other areas. In general, extensive and detailed pre-audit requirements should be eliminated in favor of a strong post-audit procedure containing appropriate sanctions for improper expenditures.

4. There should be more collection and dissemination of information about higher education in Arkansas, information which allows meaningful comparisons of programs within and among institutions, and which provides added bases for management and budget decisions. We should not avoid, but should encourage, a healthy competitive spirit among the programs and institutions. There should be appropriate incentives in terms of recognition, budget considerations, and otherwise to reward those programs and institutions which achieve superior results.

5. There is a distinct need for greater emphasis on students - both prospective students and those already enrolled. We have two major problems in this respect. First, we have a comparatively low percentage of high school graduating seniors who

enroll in college: less than 40% compared to a national average greater than 60%. The other problem is that, once this reduced group is enrolled, too few go on to complete a baccalaureate degree. Strong efforts are being made to improve the preparation of students in elementary and secondary schools. Higher education needs to focus more attention on counseling and advising prospective and current students. By giving greater personal attention to the individual student's particular needs and understanding of requirements, reasons for requirements, and ways to succeed, it will be possible to have a significant impact on the success rate of those students who enroll.

6. As more fully discussed in Recommendation 43 and its background, the QHESC has recommended only very limited legislation and recommends that most improvements in this report be implemented by administrative and institutional action.

Relationship to Other Groups and Committees

The QHESC was created and appointed and has functioned during a period of intense interest in education at all levels. A national study which focused on the mediocrity of public elementary and secondary education led the way. In Arkansas, the work of the QHESC followed the completion of a report by the Education Standards Committee. The recommendations of that committee included standards for school districts and for student achievement at various levels. Of particular importance were the competency tests required of students at specific points and the mandatory course offerings and course completion requirements.

The QHESC cannot overemphasize the necessity for the implementation of elementary and secondary school standards at least as strong as those now prescribed legislatively or by the State Board of Education. Those standards are an appropriate beginning for improvements in quality in public elementary and secondary schools, but they are just that: a beginning. The Governor, the General Assembly, and others committed to the improvement of our state and its people should not only safeguard and defend those standards from all attacks, but should take every opportunity to evaluate and upgrade them. Only by so doing will Arkansas provide the opportunity which its citizens so richly deserve and desperately need to be economically competitive, politically and socially effective, and personally fulfilled.

The improvements in course offerings and student preparation in elementary and secondary schools are the foundation upon which improvements in higher education sought by this report are based. Without standards at least as strong as those now in place, much of what can and should be done in higher education will be impossible, or at least much more difficult.

A substantial part of the resources allocated to higher education is now being expended on remedial course offerings designed to correct deficiencies of entering students and make them fully qualified to undertake college level work in all areas. The improved level of preparation of entering students which will result from the implementation of the elementary and secondary standards

will permit significant reductions in remedial course offerings and the allocation of those resources to other areas and endeavors.

Recommendation 1:

> **The State Board of Education, the Governor, and the General Assembly should support, defend, and strengthen the standards for elementary and secondary schools adopted on recommendation of the Education Standards Committee. Adherence to those standards is essential to the improvement of higher education in Arkansas.**

At its 1983 session, the National Advisory Board of First Commerical Bank, N.A. addressed the issue of how the state should achieve the goal of raising the per capita income to at least the national average. It focused on the possibility of a coordinated effort to capitalize upon the existing institutions' efforts in biomedical research in central Arkansas. Part of its report contained an important conclusion which is applicable statewide and to all institutions:

> . . .there must be a commitment to a partnership between (sic) government, private sector leaders, and academia that can and will objectively assess the strengths of the state or of a given area.

This conclusion gained further importance with the announcement by Arkansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc. in August, 1984 that an industry complex emphasizing biomedical technology would be located in central Arkansas with construction to begin in December 1984.

The QHESC agrees with the conclusion reached and endorses the analytical approach employed by the National Advisory Board in its 1983 report.

Recommendation 2:

> **The boards of trustees, boards of visitors, administrators, and faculties of the institutions should lead the way in establishing an ongoing partnership including government, private sector leaders, and all levels of education that can and will assess the strengths of the state or a given area of the state, and provide a basis and a blueprint for responsiveness of the institutions to those needs.**

CHARACTERISTICS OF ARKANSAS AND HER PEOPLE

Before it was possible to make recommendations on quality improvements in higher education, the QHESC found it necessary to review the present social and economic conditions of Arkansas and other states and to develop a vision of the future.

Economic Descriptors of the State

Business indicators. Two ways of characterizing the business and economic situation of Arkansas are by examining the allocation of persons by major industrial groups and by occupation. In 1980, the total employment of persons 16 years of age and over was 875,733. Table 1 reflects employment in the major industrial groups.

TABLE 1. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN ARKANSAS BY MAJOR INDUSTRIAL GROUP, 1980

Major Industrial Group	Number	Percent
Retail Trade	137,045	15.6
Manufacturing-Durable Goods	122,998	14.0
Manufacturing-Non-Durable Goods	96.722	11.0
Educational Services	71.771	8.2
Health Services	63.957	7.3
Construction	61.276	7.0
Agriculture. Forestry, etc.	59,212	6.8

Nearly 70% of the employment in Arkansas was in the major industrial groups shown in Table 1. Although Arkansas is an agricultural state, less than 7% of the employment is now in that industry, primarily because of major improvements in production methods that have taken place. Retail trade represents the largest group and only 25% are employed in manufacturing industries. A second measure is the allocation of employed persons by major occupational group as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. THE ALLOCATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS IN ARKANSAS BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, 1980

Occupational Group	Number	Percent
Precision Production, Craft & Repair Occupations	123,909	14.1
Administrative Support Occupations, including Clerical	120,325	13.7
Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors	105,993	12.1
Service Occupations, except Protective & Household	90,869	10.4
Sales Occupations	85,552	9.8
Professional Specialties	84,534	9.7
Executive. Administrative, and Managerial	72.970	8.3

Table 2 shows that Arkansas citizens are most often employed in craft and repair, administrative support, production, and other occupations which are most likely to be impacted by increased technology in the future.

The great changes taking place with ever increasing rapidity in the economic, social. political, and cultural institutions of the United States and the world have been repeatedly chronicled in both popular and scholarly literature. In the widely read and acclaimed book Megatrends, author John Naisbitt, by statistical analysis of the frequency of mention in newspapers, magazines, and other publications, identified ten major trends now taking place. Many other writers have made similar observations and forecasts.

Of particular interest to higher education and the future business climate of Arkansas and the United States are the four following trends that have been noted:

1. The extremely rapid rate at which knowledge and information is accumulating. The volume of knowledge continues to double over decreasing time periods.

2. The explosive growth of the number, power, speed, and use of computers, and the pervasiveness of their impact. both now and in the future.

3. The fundamental change in the American economy from one based on the production of goods to one based on the processing and use of information. Another part of this phenomenon is the expected dramatic growth in the use of robots, usually controlled by computers, to perform, with much higher degrees of reliability, tasks traditionally performed by human beings.

4. Related somewhat to each of the above is the likelihood that a person will change occupations several times during his or her productive life. As information grows and technology becomes more sophisticated, particular jobs or tasks will be replaced by different kinds of jobs and tasks. The flexibility and adaptability necessary to accommodate these comparatively frequent job changes may become virtual necessities for economic survival.

The present distribution of employment in Arkansas and the emerging trends in business point to an economic future for the state and the citizens that will suffer unless a higher priority is placed on education at all levels.

Population and growth. The decennial census figures from 1950 indicate that Arkansas lost population until the mid-1960's and then again started a population growth trend. The following table shows both national and Arkansas population figures.

TABLE 3. POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND ARKANSAS AT TEN-YEAR INTERVALS FROM 1950 TO 1980

Year	United States	Arkansas	Ark. as a % of U.S.
1950	151,325,798	1.909,511	1.26%
1960	179,323,175	1.786.272	1.00%
1970	203,302,031	1.923,322	0.95%
1980	226,545,805	2,286.435	1.01%

Over one-half of the population of Arkansas is concentrated in three areas: the central area, within a radius of 50 miles of Little Rock, contains approximately 750,000 people. or approximately 30% of the total; the northwest corridor comprised of Sebastian. Crawford, Washington, and Benton counties contains over 300,000 people. or approximately 13%; and a seven-county area in northeast Arkansas (Greene, Craighead, Mississippi, Poinsett, Cross, Crittenden, and St. Francis) contains over 280,000 people. or more than 12%. The remaining 45% is dispersed throughout the rest of the state. The racial composition of the population is 82.7% white, 16.3% black, and 1.0% other.

Arkansas has historically been heavily oriented to agriculture with the major production of crops located along the eastern side of the state in the river delta area. As farming and planting operations grew in size and larger and more sophisticated equipment became available. fewer farm-related workers were needed. At the same time, tourism and retirement industries have developed in the more mountainous north central and northwest parts of the state. This has resulted in Arkansas population trends which are slowly moving from the south and southeast to the north and northwest.

As a sunbelt state central in location, Arkansas enjoys many natural advantages for future growth. It has a mild climate, abundant natural resources, a good energy supply, relatively good transportation. willing workers instilled with the work ethic, and real estate prices that remain reasonable when compared with other parts of the United States. It is geographically located at the hub of a radius of 400 miles from the capital city containing a number of major population concentrations, several of which are connected by four-lane highways running through Little Rock.

Arkansas population growth in the future will depend on developing and attracting industries that will provide employment for state citizens. As production and service industries continue their technological development, they will increasingly search for locations with a strong educational system from kindergarten through the doctoral program to support their efforts.

Personal and Family income. The census data collected in 1980 indicate that Arkansas continues to lag behind other states in personal and family income. Per capita income for Arkansas was $5,614, compared to $7,298 for the United States. Stated another way, the per capita income in Arkansas is 23% below the U.S. average.

Probably the best descriptor of the financial well-being of the people in a state is median family income where a similar story is revealed. It represents

all income to families and, in many cases, the income of two or more members of the family is included. However, it does provide a reasonable measure of the median amount of money available to families for meeting their living expenses and is a meaningful measure of differences between states.

The median family income in Arkansas when the 1980 census was taken was $14,641. This means that half of the families lived on less than that amount and half received more. By comparison, the 1980 census figures showed a U.S. average of $19,917, a difference of 26.5%. Families in the ten most prosperous states received $22,748 and $16,396 in the ten least prosperous states.

An analysis of the 1979 federal income tax filings from Arkansas showed that 50.8% of those who filed did so on an adjusted gross income of less that $10,000 and 67.5% on less than $15,000. Further analysis showed that Arkansas exceeded national proportions in all income categories below $15,000 and was below the national averages in all higher categories. The largest variation was in the $25,000-50,000 income category which included 16.2% of the people nationally but only 10.9% of Arkansas residents.

Social Descriptors of the State

Education levels. According to the 1980 census figures for Arkansas, only 55.5% of the population 25 years of age and older had completed high school. Only 10.8% had completed four or more years of college (compared to 16.2% nationally) and another 11.5% had finished some education beyond the high school. Nearly 78% of the people had no education beyond high school and almost half had not even completed high school. Table 4 shows the number and percent of adults at various educational levels.

TABLE 4. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF ARKANSAS CITIZENS 25 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER BY RACE AND EDUCATION LEVEL, 1980

Grade Level Completed	White	Black	Other	Total
0-8 (Elementary)	280,946 (24.4%)	74,244 (42.4%)	3,480 (27.9%)	358,670 (26.8%)
1-3 Years High School	197,527 (17.2%)	37,334 (21.3%)	2,096 (16.8%)	236,967 (17.7%)
4 Years High School	400,203 (34.8%)	39,562 (22.6%)	3,664 (29.4%)	443,429 (33.2%)
1-3 Years College	138,211 (12.0%)	13,513 (7.7%)	1,651 (13.3%)	153,375 (11.5%)
4 or More Years College	132,580 (11.5%)	10,529 (6.0%)	1,568 (12.6%)	144,677 (10.8%)
TOTALS	1,149,467 (100%)	175,192 (100%)	12,459 (100%)	1,337,118 (100%)

This table shows that a significant disparity exists between the educational levels of black and white citizens. Nearly 64% of black adults in Arkansas have not completed high school and only 6% have completed college.

These figures show a distressingly low level of education of the adult population of Arkansas but they are even more significant when compared to other states with whom we must compete. In the ten states with the highest median family incomes, there are medians of over 70% high school graduates and nearly 20% with four or more years of college. Even in the ten least prosperous states, the median education completed at all levels is higher than in Arkansas.

Illiteracy. Closely related to the question of educational levels is the question of illiteracy. According to the Adult Education Section of the Vocational and Technical Education Division of the Department of Education, approximately 200,000 adult Arkansans read below the sixth grade level. With a literacy rate just barely above 80%. correspondingly greater efforts will be required to persuade young Arkansans of college and school age of the value and necessity of higher and higher levels of education.

College going rates. While precise figures are not readily available, an approximation of the college-going rates in Arkansas can be obtained by comparing the number of students who are full-time, first-time entering freshmen at Arkansas colleges and universities in a given fall semester with the number of seniors graduating from Arkansas high schools the preceding spring. The figures are imperfect because enrollment data at the Arkansas institutions do not include Arkansas residents enrolling in institutions in other states. With this in mind, the following are the recent college-going rates for Arkansas:

1980	43.0%
1981	39.6%
1982	38.2%
1983	39.3%

The concern arises when these attendance rates are compared with a national rate in the range of 60% and when it is noted that the trend in Arkansas has generally been down rather than up.

Projections of Economic and Social Needs of the Future

Needs identified by business and industry leaders. At the same time our economy and society are becoming more technical and complicated, business leaders from many diverse segments of the economy are stressing the need for their supervisory, middle management, and executive personnel to be more broadly, rather than more narrowly educated.

At public hearings conducted by the QHESC, business and other leaders from across the state frequently echoed this concern. It often took the form of satisfaction with the technical training brought to the organization by persons who had attended institutions of higher education, but dissatisfaction with their lack of skill in communication, interpersonal relationships, and analysis or problem-solving. Many such business leaders expressed it this way: Give us

people who are skilled at communications, analysis, and interpersonal relationships, and who are competent in a discipline, and we will teach them the particulars of our business. Persons with these skills are the ones who can identify, evaluate, and adapt to changing circumstances and who will be critical to the success of many enterprises and institutions in the foreseeable future.

At the other end of the spectrum, there must be sufficient specialization, particularly in certain engineering and other technical fields, to put Arkansas on the cutting edge. The emphasis here should be on areas relevant to our natural and agricultural resources, and to areas in which we already have a solid base upon which to build. One such example might be the significant biomedical research now taking place in central Arkansas at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, the National Center for Toxicological Research, the Veterans Administration Medical Center, the Graduate Institute of Technology, and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. This possibility is treated in depth in Toxicology: Today's Target for Tomorrow in Central Arkansas, the 1983 report of the National Advisory Board of First Commercial Bank, N.A.

The fields of agriculture and nutrition are also logical possibilities for specialization emphasis in research and teaching, given the importance of agriculture in the economy of Arkansas, and given the existing base of biomedical research being conducted.

Changing nature of business. The nature of the business enterprise has changed drastically since the late 1970's and every indication is that such changes will continue during the remainder of this century. Manufacturing plants that once employed large numbers of people with low skill levels for assembly or piecework have closed, moved to other countries with larger pools of inexpensive labor, or they have automated their production processes. Whatever the case, jobs once available to people with low levels of education and training are continuing to decrease.

A great deal of attention has been drawn to the "high tech" explosion in both technical and popular literature. Industries categorized as high tech are projected as the primary growth industries in the future and promise to continue the change in the nature of business. According to a 1982 report prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, 26% of the increase in manufacturing jobs between 1975 and 1979 were high tech jobs. High technology industries accounted for 33% of all manufacturing jobs in 1955 but had grown to 40% of the total by 1979.

The importance of education to technology-based industry cannot be overemphasized. Included in the above referenced report was a survey of 691 high technology companies throughout the United States to identify factors that influence the location choices of such companies. The single most significant factor in those choices was the availability of professional, technical, and skilled workers.

Increased dependence on higher education. States and communities are more frequently looking to their higher education institutions for services concentrated on the campuses. Where the expertise possessed by faculty members in various disciplines once was exclusively reserved for the teaching of students

and the research laboratories were isolated for contributions to new academic knowledge, those resources are now being recognized as critical to new developments and continued economic independence for the nation.

University campuses are being relied upon with increasing regularity for the solutions to complex business and societal problems. Many have already pointed out the trend toward more business/government/higher education partnerships aimed at problem-solving and the dissemination of information.

Research, sometimes considered a tangential responsibility of higher education institutions to be carried out only when time can be robbed from the teaching role, is now an important factor in the exploration of the new frontiers on which business and industry will base their future success in competition with other industrialized or industrializing countries. Teaching will remain the central function of colleges and universities but research and public service can be expected to gain greater importance and have heavier demands placed upon them by society in general in the coming years.

GOVERNANCE AND ORGANIZATION

Governance Structure

Pursuant to Amendment 33 to the Arkansas Constitution, the four-year institutions are governed by Boards of Trustees appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Pursuant to statute, a popular vote in the relevant area is necessary to establish a community college and to select members of its Board of Trustees. Also created by statute was the higher education coordinating agency, the ADHE, governed by the SBHE, with appointments made by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Table 5 shows the various boards, the number of members, and the terms of office.

In any consideration of governance change, Amendment 33 must be taken into account. The most important limitations are found in sections 2 and 3:

> Section 2. The board or commission of any institution, governed by this amendment, shall not be abolished nor shall the powers vested in any such board or commission be transferred, unless the institution is abolished or consolidated with some other State institution. In the event of abolition or consolidation, the new board or commission shall consist of a membership of five, seven, or ten.
>
> Section 3. The membership of any such board or commission now in existence shall not be increased or decreased in number after the effective date of this amendment nor shall the number of members of any such board or commission created after this amendment is in operation be increased or decreased subsequent to its creation.

TABLE 5. HIGHER EDUCATION BOARDS, THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS, AND THE TERMS OF OFFICE.

Board	Number of Members	Term of Office	Institutions
State Board of Higher Education	10	10	All-Coord.
Ark. State University	5	5	ASU, ASUB
Ark. Tech University	5	5	ATU
East Ark. Comm. College	9	6	EACC
Garland Co. Comm. College	9	6	GCCC
Hend. State University	7	7	HSU
Miss. Co. Comm. College	9	6	MCCC
No. Ark. Comm. College	9	6	NACC
Phillips Co. Comm. College	9	6	PCCC
Rich Mtn. Comm. College	9	6	RMCC
So. Ark. University 1/	5	5	SAU, SAUE, SAUT.
Univ. of Arkansas 2/	10	10	UAF, UALR, UAM, UAMS, UAPB.
Univ. of Cent. Arkansas	7	7	UCA
Westark Comm. College	9	6	WCC

1/ SAUT has an advisory committee appointed by the SAU Board of Trustees and an advisory committee for the Fire Training Academy appointed by the Governor. SAUE has an advisory committee appointed by the SAU Board of Trustees.

2/ UALR has a Board of Visitors appointed by the UA Board of Trustees, UAPB has a Board of Visitors appointed by the Governor, and UAF, UAM, and UAMS have no Boards of Visitors.

A variety of governance structures are being used in other states. They involve numerous combinations of a single board of trustees or regents, a coordinating agency, and institutional boards of trustees or visitors. Some states have a number of multi-campus boards while others have single campus boards or all institutions under one board. Some boards were established by constitution and others by statute. In each case, the number of members and terms of office vary widely. While several states are examining their structures and making changes, there does not appear to be a clear trend in any direction. Some states are attempting to solve their problems by moving toward more centralized power and authority, while others are moving away from it to solve the same problems.

Since there were no clear trends and no clear governance model which would provide the greatest potential for success, the QHESC concentrated only on the situation in Arkansas taking into consideration the nature of the state and the history of state government and higher education. Although there are an almost unlimited number of combinations that might be considered, the QHESC identified those that seemed most common in other states and reviewed each as it might be implemented in Arkansas.

Single board model. Under this arrangement, all institutions, four-year and two-year, would be governed under a single board. Amendment 33 would clearly permit consolidation of all institutions under any of the existing boards but whether all could be governed under a board newly created for that purpose is unclear.

The greatest apparent structural advantage of a single board would be the opportunity for establishing policies for operation which would apply equally to all institutions. It would vest a great deal of power over higher education throughout the state in a single body headed by a chief operating officer who would speak for all institutions. In many respects, doing business with the institutions would be easier and accountability could be more easily established. Such matters as transfer of credit and cooperative programs could be organizationally mandated.

There are also disadvantages to a single board model. Although consistency in policy development could be mandated, actual acceptance of those mandates could be challenged by constituencies of the various campuses and force compromise on the board and chief executive officer which would not be in the best interest of some or all of the campuses. The governance of 20 campuses with quite varied roles would be a formidable task which could result in a bureaucracy which would truncate the varied roles. There would also be a possibility that problems might result from having too much power vested in an individual or small group of individuals.

There would be a special problem in regard to the community colleges. Those seven institutions have local millages voted by the people within the districts for facilities and initial equipment. Should a single board for all institutions be created, assumption of bonded indebtedness of the various districts would necessarily become an obligation of the state with possible claims that investments already made by local communities should be reimbursed by the state.

Two board model. Under the two board model, one board would govern all four-year institutions and one would govern the two-year institutions. Again, such an arrangement would appear feasible under Amendment 33 if existing boards became the two remaining, but it is unclear if two new boards could be created.

The advantages and disadvantages for this model would be nearly the same as for the single board model and the community college bonded indebtedness problem would remain. An additional advantage might be greater consistency of roles among institutions governed by each board leading to easier governance. A disadvantage might be cited, however, in the possibility that the two boards might become highly competitive for appropriations and other purposes.

Three board model. The 20 campuses in Arkansas generally fall into three different role categories: one for the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville as a research, graduate-oriented institution, one for the four-year regional institutions, and one for the two-year institutions. Three different governing boards could be created recognizing the three differing roles.

Again, the advantages and disadvantages would be much the same with some variation in degree. Greater ease of governance might result because of the consistency of roles but further divisions between the three boards could develop. The community college bonded indebtedness situation would also be present in this model.

Single campus boards. From their establishment in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and generally up to the early 1970's, each campus was governed by a separate board. This model would require that the five campuses of the University of Arkansas, the three campuses of Southern Arkansas University, and the two campuses of Arkansas State University be returned to independent status. The committee is unable to interpret whether Amendment 33 would permit this action but believes a problem might exist.

This structure would provide the greatest ease of governance for boards since each would be held responsible for only one campus. Competition between campuses could more easily develop, however, and it would be more difficult to mandate consistency in policies. Therefore, this structure might require some increases in the responsibility of the state coordinating agency. The community college situation would not be a problem in this structure since the existing boards and circumstances for those institutions could be retained.

Multiple-campus regional boards. Another possible organizational arrangement would be regional boards governing one or more four-year and one or more two-year institutions. One possibility might be as follows:

NW Region	Central Region	NE Region
UAF	UALR	ASU
NACC	UCA	MCCC
WCC	ATU	EACC
	ASUB	
	UAMS	

So. Region	SW Region	SE Region
SAU	HSU	UAM
SAUE	GCCC	UAPB
SAUT	RMCC	PCCC

This structure has the advantage of including institutions in various regions of the state with a common governance and the possibility of two-year campuses easily serving as "feeder" schools to four-year institutions. The various regions generally have more commonality of interest than with other regions which could be better served by a governance body selected from within each of the regions.

This possibility includes the community college bonded indebtedness problem and might tend to foster a greater amount of regionalism which has generally been a problem for the state. As with the single board model, governance could be complicated for the board by including institutions with differing roles to be served.

Conclusion. The QHESC concludes that none of these models, or any combinations which it considered, has the clear potential for solving any more of the higher education problems in Arkansas than any of the others, or that any one would be superior to the present structure. Each possibility, including the present structure, has advantages and disadvantages which, to some degree, counter one another.

The desirability of any structure generally depends on individual preferences for the centralization or decentralization of power. Those who put the greatest value on centralized power would obviously prefer a single board. Those who put great value on the decentralization of power would prefer the single campus board structure.

The general consensus of the QHESC is that the governance structure is not the critical element in improving the quality of higher education in Arkansas. It could easily develop that all energies were expended on proposing or resisting new governance structures as a solution to all problems when, in fact, the problems that most need to be faced would remain untouched. It is the opinion of the QHESC that the governance structure remains a matter of preference among various institutions and individuals but that no single organization promises to solve many more problems than it creates. Rather, the QHESC believes that the energies of the institutions and public policy makers could more profitably be expended on quality questions than structural questions. The reduction of regionalism and provincialism in higher education is primarily a matter of leadership at the various campuses and that will not change by changing the governance structure. For these reasons, the committee does not propose a major change in governance. There are, however, certain elements of the present structure that deserve comment.

1. Although the State Constitution is controlling, the QHESC believes that boards of only five members are too small leaving potential instability in policy development for those institutions. It is the opinion of the committee that boards of 7-10 members would be optimal.

2. The QHESC believes the evidence is clear that many do not understand the desirable division between centralized authority and decentralized decision-making. One of the greatest needs in Arkansas, and apparently in other states considering governance changes, is a clear, written identification of those decisions that should be made at the institutional level and those in which a central authority should be involved. Unless there is an interest in a major constitutional amendment, which the committee believes is not essential, it would be best to retain the present governance structure, develop a written policy on centralized and decentralized decision-making, review existing practices in light of that policy, and pass the necessary legislation.

3. The written policy and institutional boards should always recognize that:

   a. Institutions exist to serve the public; and

   b. Boards of Trustees are bodies corporate, entrusted with managing the property and programs of the institutions, and should always be accountable to the people of the State of Arkansas in the discharge of their responsibilities.

4. Amendment 33 to the State Constitution was initiated by petition and passed in 1942 in an effort by the people to reduce political influences in the governance and operation of higher education institutions. That principle should continue to be supported and every effort made to further reduce purely political influences within the higher education system throughout the state. There are two main aspects to this situation.

   A. There is evidence nationwide that individuals are more and more often seeking appointment to higher education boards and commissions because of political ambitions or single-purpose objectives rather than a commitment to the long-term strength and well-being of the institutions they represent. Those making board and commission appointments should continue to give primary consideration to the qualifications for service and the motives of individuals seeking appointment.

   B. Arkansas is unique among the 50 states in having a state higher education agency director who is

appointed by the SBHE, confirmed by the Governor, and serves at the pleasure of the Governor. The director is, in the opinion of the QHESC, subject to political pressures and considerations unnecessary and inappropriate for the professional director of a coordinating agency. The position is properly analogous to an institution's president who is selected by and serves at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees.

5. While it has already been stated that a clearer division between centralized and decentralized decision-making should be established, the QHESC believes that the state higher education agency must be vested with sufficient authority to insure that certain organizational aspects of higher education can be accomplished. Of particular concern would be assisting institutions in:

   A. Establishing and implementing the basic criteria of quality.

   B. Adopting and operating according to role and scope and/or mission statements that best serve the people of Arkansas.

   C. Assuring that there is no inappropriate or unnecessary duplication of new or existing programs.

   D. Seeing to critical needs such as libraries, maintenance, etc.

Recommendation 3:

A. Each institution should continue to have its own board of trustees, selected as now provided by law. Local decision-making machinery should be further strengthened, not weakened.

B. The General Assembly should appoint a committee comprising representatives of the institutions and their boards, the SBHE, relevant state agencies or departments, and the General Assembly for the purpose of developing a clear policy statement of the division between decisions which should be made at the institutional level and those in which a central authority should be involved. That committee should also recommend to the General Assembly legislation, if any, needed to implement the policy statement. All public policy makers should then unite in insisting that this statement prevails when questions arise in the future.

C. As the overall goals and needs of the State of Arkansas are identified, clarified, and articulated, the State Board of Higher Education, in conjunction with the institutions, should be given additional responsibility in the areas of quality

assurance, establishment of institutional role and scope and/or mission statements, reduction in inappropriate and unnecessary duplication of new and existing programs, and assuring that the critical needs of institutions are addressed.

D. The statutes should be changed so that the Director of the ADHE is appointed by the SBHE and serves at its pleasure.

E. In selecting appointees to higher education boards and commissions, the Governor and members of the Senate should continue to give primary consideration to the qualifications of the individuals with negative consideration given to political ambitions or single-purpose objectives.

The Number and Scope of Institutions

While the QHESC is unaware of any specific studies or proposals to eliminate any particular institutions, it has heard suggestions that Arkansas has too many institutions. That is not a new question. At least as early as 63 years ago it was stated in a report on Arkansas higher education that, ". . .Arkansas is at present oversupplied with colleges, or what is more significant, undersupplied with college students".

It has sometimes been suggested that Arkansas has more colleges compared to population than the average of other states in the nation leading to an immediate conclusion that too many colleges are being supported. A similar comparison could be made between the number of colleges and the geographic area to be served, which would show Arkansas lower than the national average. Neither comparison totally answers the question. When taking both population and geographic area served into consideration, reflected more appropriately by population density (people per square mile), Arkansas compares favorably.

An analysis of current educational levels and rates of attendance has led to the QHESC's conclusion that Arkansas is fortunate to have established institutions available to handle the larger numbers of students who will be enrolled as a result of increases in the college-going rates and rates of retention recommended in this report.

Approximately 39% of the students graduating from high school are now enrolling in Arkansas institutions. If this rate is improved to the national average of about 60%, nearly 3,000 more beginning students will be enrolled each year, even when the projected decline in the number of high school graduates is taken into consideration. In 1981, approximately 11,300 of the 29,710 high school graduates (38.3%) enrolled in college. At the lowest point in the projections, 1993/94, there will be 23,600 graduates; a 60% going rate would mean 14,200 enrolling in college as freshmen. The increase in total enrollment which would follow the increase in freshman enrollment would be in the range of 8,000 to 9,000 students. The likelihood of achieving these enrollment levels will be enhanced by the elementary and secondary school standards (because more high school graduates will be prepared for college) and by more effective retention programs (because the success rate of those enrolling will be improved).

These circumstances, together with the geography and population distribution of the state, the present location of the institutions, and the roles, scopes, and missions of the institutions, indicate that the existing institutions will be needed to accommodate the influx of students which must be a part of the plan to improve the educational levels of our citizens.

There are, however, some existing organizational matters, generally not considered major in scope, which would streamline education at the postsecondary level and should be given further attention.

Graduate Institute of Technology. The Graduate Institute of Technology (GIT) was established in 1957 in Little Rock as a unit of the University of Arkansas. At present, it reports directly to the President and has no direct affiliation with any University of Arkansas campus. In June, 1983, an advisory committee previously appointed by the president was confirmed by the UA Board of Trustees to study alternative roles for GIT and to recommend its appropriate future role and organizational structure. No decision has yet been reached by that committee.

As stated earlier in this document, increased research activity in technology-based fields is a critical element in the future economic development of the state. In light of these needs, the QHESC views the status of GIT as a situation which requires immediate attention.

Relationship of colleges to vocational-technical schools. In addition to the 20 college and university campuses, there are now 23 postsecondary vocational-technical schools operating in Arkansas. Several of the vo-tech schools and some of the two-year colleges have small enrollments and are, therefore, inefficient to operate.

Westark Community College at Fort Smith and Phillips County Community College at Helena have both been designated for several years as the vo-tech schools for those communities. Both are comprehensive two-year schools with approximately half of the student body enrolled in college transfer courses and the other half in vocational or occupational programs. At several other locations (Harrison, Forrest City, Blytheville, Hot Springs, and El Dorado) both two-year colleges and postsecondary vocational-technical schools are operated in the same communities. There are examples of excellent cooperation and simultaneous enrollment of students in both institutions but it is more the exception than the rule.

The QHESC considers the examples of WCC and PCCC convincing that the marriage of vocational and college transfer programs provides improved educational opportunities through comprehensive programs and at a reduction in overhead costs.

Recommendation 4:

A. If the college-going rate is raised as it should be, no further consideration need be given to eliminating institutions. Rather, all attention should be directed toward more clearly defining unique roles, scopes, and missions for the existing institutions. Serious consideration should not be given in the near future, however, to establishing any more colleges anywhere in the state.

B. There should be an early resolution to the status of the Graduate Institute of Technology (GIT) through the existing advisory structure.

C. Where two-year institutions and vocational-technical schools exist in the same area, the two should be combined into one comprehensive institution.

CURRICULUM AND STUDENTS

Admission of Students to Colleges and Universities

In April, 1983, the SBHE formed a task force to study and recommend admissions standards for the institutions. The task force worked throughout the next several months and standards were adopted by the State Board in February, 1984.

The QHESC believes the admissions standards adopted by the SBHE will lead to a uniform and high-level academic foundation upon which postsecondary institutions may base their curricula.

Recommendation 5:

The higher admissions standards adopted by the SBHE in February, 1984, should be adopted by all four-year institutions not later than August, 1985. (These standards are attached as appendix A.)

Access to postsecondary education in Arkansas needs to be encouraged. Admission to an institution, however, should not guarantee admission to all programs within that institution. In balancing the need for higher standards for admission while continuing to encourage larger numbers of students to enroll, specific circumstances must be taken into account.

Recommendation 6:

An open door policy should be continued for admission to vocational or occupational courses or programs.

Most will agree that the new education standards adopted for elementary and secondary schools will begin to bring about improved educational outcomes for those students who graduate from Arkansas high schools after 1987. In each year after 1987, students will reflect increasing competence in the five "basic" areas as the standards implemented will affect them earlier in the educational process. Be this as it may, Arkansas will continue to be faced with students who may be intellectually capable but who have not met desired levels of academic competence. Consequently, postsecondary institutions, in responding to Arkansas' need to improve generally the level of quality in the higher education component, must implement measures to meet the needs of all students, including those who enroll with various levels of academic skill deficiencies.

Recommendation 7:

A. All students should be assessed, using the ACT or SAT and various supplementary examinations, to determine whether and to what extent remediation is required.

B. Beginning in 1986, all students with a composite score below 16 on the ACT, or equivalent, should be assigned to academic skill development activities in those areas that have been determined to be weak. Beginning in 1988, the composite score should be raised to 18.

C. Regardless of the composite test score, appropriate skill development activities should be made available where assessment identifies specific areas of weakness.

Conditional Admission and Non-Traditional Students

Admission standards, whether conditional or unconditional, must be flexible enough to allow admission for those students who seek the advantages of higher learning outside the "normal" college experience. These students would include those who seek short-term occupational or vocational training, those non-traditional students who seek a college education following an extended lapse of time since high school graduation, and those who return to college after a lengthy absence.

Recommendation 8:

A. Institutions should have an admission classification designed to allow students to enroll for short-term programs which do not lead to degrees.

B. Students who seek a college education following an extended lapse of time since high school graduation or who seek to change from non-degree to degree-seeking status, whether as first time enrollees, re-enrollees in the same institution or by transfer from another institution, should not be assessed exclusively on the basis of admission requirements applicable to traditional college students, but rather on the basis of other appropriate criteria.

Retention of Students in Colleges and Universities

A serious and immediate problem, one with long range ramifications, is that of student retention. Out of each 100 Arkansas high school graduates, less than 40 enter an Arkansas college the next year. Based on current information, it appears that only about half of those will complete a baccalaureate degree. The low college-going rate of young Arkansans is distressing, but the low retention rate of those who enroll is of even greater concern. There is an urgent need for the development, at once, of coordinated retention programs which include vigorous academic monitoring by each institution. Early identification of students experiencing academic difficulty is vital. However,

identification will be ineffective without active follow-up. Assistance, advice, and psychological support from faculty are necessary. Exit interviews should be held for those students attempting to withdraw from school and the very process for withdrawal should be strengthened. It is essential that each institution recognize its responsibility for the development and successful implementation of a comprehensive system which addresses all aspects of student retention.

The most vital component of successful retention is faculty participation in a comprehensive advising program. The advising program includes two basic elements: course placement and scheduling, and counseling. It is imperative that faculty members take a personal interest in their students and assume responsibility in the institutional retention effort. Specific faculty members should be designated to advise and counsel with students beyond the normal classroom contact and beyond the usual advising capacity. These carefully selected faculty members should receive intensive in-service training in student counseling and advising. This activity should be recognized with release time and in evaluation criteria for salary, promotion, and tenure.

Another important component of a retention program is family and parental involvement. Current interpretations of the federal Family Rights and Privacy Act (Buckley Amendment) have led to colleges withholding information on student grades, progress, and problems from parents. It is crucial that parents be brought back into their child's college experiences. Colleges can accomplish this by explaining in their informational materials the nature of the Buckley Amendment and by providing parents with forms requiring the student's signature for releasing progress reports.

Recommendation 9:

A. Each institution should develop a comprehensive retention program that includes close attention to advising for proper academic placement and counseling for all students throughout their enrollment in the institution.

B. Although all students should receive regular attention from advisors, particular attention should be directed toward those students who may be having personal or academic difficulty. Faculty or other advisors selected to deal with such problems should receive intensive training, be required to work closely with the campus counseling center, and be recognized for their increased responsibility in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

C. The retention program should include close contact with parents or guardians, dissemination of information about the federal Family Rights and Privacy Act (Buckley Amendment), and provision of forms to the parents to enable them to obtain the student's signature permitting the institution to release copies of grade and progress reports.

General Education Curriculum

Minimum core. Baccalaureate degree programs which are considered to be of the highest academic quality include a sufficient number of general education courses to provide each student, regardless of major, with a satisfactory level of skill in effective oral and written expression, in the mechanics of reasoning and critical thinking, and in the arts. Such liberal studies also provide the student with an appreciation of our cultural heritage, the complexities of human relationships, the ability to engage in sound insights into self, as well as the physical and social world in which we live, and a system of values essential for intelligent and discerning judgments and decisions.

A solid program in general studies requires each student to strengthen his skills in communication and to increase his understanding of humanities, history, social and natural sciences, mathematics, and computing required to perform well in college, in the market place, and in life. The liberal arts and sciences core is not separated philosophically, administratively, or academically from the various academic degree programs. Instead, it is formulated to serve as the foundation for professional competencies or mastery of the specific disciplines, as well as to complement and enhance the student's progress through specific academic programs.

The recommended liberal arts and sciences core of undergraduate degree programs includes basic courses and divisional electives. Although both develop the competencies described above, divisional or program-specific electives establish minimum requirements for entry into various disciplines, as well as for meeting levels of proficiency dictated in various programs of study. It is assumed that computer literacy or proficiency will be an integral part of any course of study, so that a basic requirement in that area is not deemed necessary.

Recommendation 10:

A. For all students receiving baccalaureate degrees, a basic core general education curriculum should be established, including at least the following 29 semester hours (or higher level courses) which should be completed by students within the first 60 semester hours earned:

English Composition and Grammar	**6 hours**
Oral Communication	**3 hours**
Western or World Civilization	**6 hours**
American Government or History	**3 hours**
Life Sciences (with laboratory)	**4 hours**
Physical Sciences (with laboratory)	**4 hours**
College Algebra or General Mathematics	**3 hours**
Basic Core Curriculum Total	**29 hours**

The minimum core curriculum described above is only a minimum, a floor below which institutions should not go. Institutions are encouraged to take every opportunity to prescribe core curricula of greater quantity, or quality, or both. In addition, students should be permitted to satisfy the specified

course requirements, when appropriate, by established standardized testing procedures.

B. A divisional elective general education curriculum should be established consisting of the following 15 semester hours:

Literature	**3 hours**
Social Sciences (From department other than history, such as sociology, psychology, economics, geography, anthropology, or political science)	**3 hours**
Humanities and Fine Arts (From at least two different areas including art, music, philosophy, or drama)	**6 hours**
Foreign Language (or successful passage of proficiency examination)	**3 hours**
Divisional Elective Curriculum Total	**15 hours**

Minimum course content. In order for the basic core general education curriculum to meet minimum standards at the various institutions, the courses included within the curriculum must contain at least the same minimum elements.

Recommendation 11:

A. The ADHE should appoint a faculty committee to write a guide of minimum principles and concepts to be included in each course in the basic core general education curriculum to be used by each institution in establishing the minimum elements of each course specified. The committee for each course should include a representative from the department responsible for that course in each institution.

B. Members of the appointed committees should serve specified terms and meet periodically to review, revise, and update the guides.

Evaluation. The required 29 hours in the basic core general education curriculum should assure a solid, broad academic background. Every effort should be made to assess the educational experiences offered in these basic courses.

Recommendation 12:

A. The ADHE should appoint a committee, widely representative of all institutions, to decide upon an assessment to be made of all students with respect to skills in reading, effective oral and written communication, and mathematics, which the basic core general education requirements are intended to provide.

B. The test selected should be given to students in each institution, including graduates from two-year institutions who seek to enroll in four-year institutions. The test should be taken after completion of the basic core general education curriculum courses and prior to the completion of 75 semester credit hours.

C. For the first four years (academic years 1986-87 through 1989-90), the test results should be used to evaluate and improve the general education curriculum at each institution. Beginning with academic year 1990-91, successful completion of the test with a score prescribed by the committee should be required for a student to take semester credit hours beyond 75. A student with a failing grade should be given specific academic advice and counseling regarding steps that should be taken remedy the student's deficiencies. The student may retake the test on one or more occasions.

Transfer of Credits

The improvement of articulation policies among all institutions is of critical importance in any effort to improve student access to higher education. Institutions should provide for transfer of credits with a minimum loss of credit. It is expected that bringing general education courses to an agreed upon minimum level of content will reduce the resistance now prevalent among institutions with regard to accepting each other's courses. There is a perceived need, also, to increase the numbers of students that move from two-year to four-year institutions.

Recommendation 13:

A. The 44 semester credit hours recommended for the baccalaureate degree in the basic core general education curriculum and the divisional elective general education curriculum should transfer freely among all institutions.

B. Curriculum transfer agreements similar to those now existing among some institutions in certain curricular areas should be adopted by all institutions and additional agreements should be developed with respect to other common baccalaureate degree majors.

Accreditation

The accreditation status of a college or university is a widely accepted measure of the perceived quality of that institution. High quality faculty and, to a lesser degree, high quality students are more likely to be attracted to institutions that have been "certified" by an accrediting agency as having met minimum qualitative standards.

The two types of accreditation that apply to institutions of higher education are specialized, or professional, accreditation and institutional accreditation. Specialized or professional accreditation is that recognition conferred after evaluation in a specific academic discipline. Institutional accreditation refers to evaluation and recognition that all of the components of a particular institution meet minimum levels of quality and are contributing to the achievement of the overall educational objectives of the institution.

Regional and national accrediting agencies, by their accreditation standards, do not imply that all institutions so accredited meet the same levels of quality. Accreditation means only that institutions which have been accredited have reached the threshold of acceptable academic performance and that the public is protected from unacceptable levels of quality.

Institutions in Arkansas are accredited by the regional accrediting agency. However, approval by relevant specialized agencies would benefit particular institutional programs -- schools of nursing, education, business, engineering technology, music, and mathematics, for example.

Recommendation 14:

Institutions should retain regional accreditation, seek specialized accreditation for programs which have accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), reflect in planning documents specific steps and timetables for moving toward accreditation status, and have on file documents which reflect that relevant programs meet or exceed minimum standards for accreditation by specialized accrediting agencies.

Academic Program Review

A comprehensive study of quality higher education must place academic programs among its highest priorities. In the final analysis, one criterion must remain paramount: quality education, not merely educational opportunity. The ultimate goal must be to develop fully, not just adequately, the minds of students engaged in educational pursuits. Funds should be made available to assure that quality programs are developed and maintained in institutions in Arkansas. The areas of concern center on duplication of programs, adoption of new programs, and review of existing programs. Several factors contribute to an analysis of academic programs: student needs, financial expense, and quality instruction are three of the most vital.

When considering duplication of programs, it becomes necessary to clearly understand what is meant by duplication. All institutions of higher education, by their very nature, must include certain programs to provide a full complement of basic course offerings. A full and broad curriculum in the arts and sciences is absolutely required for an institution to meet the needs of its students. Such offerings cannot be construed as duplications.

While such monitoring should be conducted, caution should be exercised to prevent sacrificing student access simply to eliminate duplication. The wasting of funds, of course, must be guarded against; on the other hand, the wasting of educational opportunities for Arkansas students is intolerable. Programs, regardless of cost, must be distributed within the state to assure relative ease of access on the undergraduate level.

Duplication on the graduate level and in the professions are areas that would benefit from close monitoring. Programs at this level attract fewer students than those at the baccalaureate level; needs, while certainly crucial, are not so widespread, and access not so vital.

Recently there have been several well-planned and effective cooperative programs involving two or more institutions, public and private. The SBHE has encouraged, and should continue to encourage, the development of additional cooperative programs.

New programs. The adoption of new programs by institutions is presently being monitored by the ADHE and the SBHE. The process seems to operate efficiently and effectively.

Recommendation 15:

A. The current process for reviewing proposals for new academic programs by the State Board of Higher Education should be continued.

B. The document entitled Criteria and Procedures for Preparing New Proposals, Revised 1975, should be retained for use in essentially its present form. The staff of the ADHE and the chief academic officers at the various institutions should review the document and jointly determine appropriate editorial changes and clarification of definitions of programs requiring formal submission and those requiring letters of notification.

Existing programs. At the present stage of development, Arkansas needs an existing program review. Moreover, effective and efficient financial management dictates ongoing reviews of all academic programs.

Existing programs should be reviewed for quality, for relevance to economic, cultural, and social needs, and for cost effectiveness. Graduate and undergraduate academic programs could be grouped into 12 areas of study. These areas might be as shown below or modified to more suitable areas by the staff of the ADHE and the chief academic officers:

1. Law	5. Business	9. Health Professions
2. Engineering	6. Fine Arts	10. Science and Mathematics
3. Education	7. Agriculture	11. Social Sciences
4. Communications	8. Home Economics	12. Doctoral Programs

Three problem areas are currently in need of special consideration. Many persons in and outside higher education have suggested to the QHESC that Arkansas, with limited resources to spend on education, should not continue to operate two law schools. This may be because the law schools are post-graduate programs which are relatively expensive and which provide essentially the same curricula at two locations for a course of study in which access to multiple programs is not deemed critical. Because valid arguments can be made for each law school's existence and location, and because the decision about whether to combine and where to locate a complex and technical unit such as a law school is beyond the proper scope and expertise of this committee, a panel of expert consultants should be utilized to assist in this process.

The second area is engineering, where new requirements are creating unprecedented demands, especially for persons trained in such specialties as microelectronics, robotics, biotechnology, sophisticated data processing, and telecommunications. It is estimated conservatively that these industries will

create ten times more jobs than all others combined. Furthermore, the demand for other engineering graduates will not abate for the next two decades. As Arkansas begins planning for economic development in technology, it is a propitious time to conduct an in-depth study of current and future needs in engineering and engineering-related disciplines. Such considerations as need, quality, productivity, and specific program impact on the state's economic base must be paramount among the elements of the study.

The Technical Education Review Commission (TERC) was created during the 1983 session of the General Assembly. Although other technical education programs are included within the scope of the work of the TERC, engineering education is an integral part. Concerns herein expressed by the QHESC relating to engineering education are also commended to the members of the TERC for their further consideration.

The third area is advanced Ph.D. level training. Doctoral training is an extremely costly proposition. Quality programs at the Ph.D. level require significant additions to library holdings, research equipment and facilities, and severely restricted instructor/graduate student ratios. Because of the intensive tutorial nature of doctoral level training, part-time study is seldom appropriate and, therefore, access is not generally a problem. Finally, at the present time, there may be an overabundance of doctoral level students in some fields such that Ph.D. students originally preparing for academic careers are increasingly forced to seek alternate employment which underutilizes their skills.

Recommendation 16:

A. The ADHE, in consultation with the institutions, should establish criteria for making judgments with respect to the maintenance, strengthening, elimination, or merger of existing academic programs and arrange for statewide reviews of all academic fields at least once each five years.

B. The program reviews should be conducted by panels of non-resident, impartial, and respected faculty members, administrators, and/or other authorities in the field, working with a review team established at each institution.

C. Law and engineering should be given first priority in the review process.

D. Funding should be made available annually to the ADHE for conducting existing academic program reviews so that such reviews may take into account both quality and quantity factors.

On-going institutional curricular review. The foregoing recommendations are not meant to replace on-going curricular reviews within institutions. These reviews are of critical importance for Arkansas students to receive state-of-the-art instruction in their chosen fields of study.

Recommendation 17:

Institutions should continuously evaluate their curricular and course content to insure that they are current and relevant. When appropriate, these evaluations should include lay or non-academic advisors who have expertise or experience in the field.

Teacher Education

America's education systems have been accused in increasingly strident terms of failing in fundamental ways to provide the quality of education this country needs to remain strong and competitive. Although the entire education spectrum has been attacked, very serious questions have been asked about the quality of teacher education, the effectiveness of the public schools, and the competence of teachers. Repeatedly voiced in the public hearings of the QHESC was a concern for the state's teacher education programs. The general opinion appears to be that teacher education programs need to be strengthened for a profession which has become increasingly demanding and important. States have implemented new and expanded evaluation programs for all teacher education majors, and more exacting licensing and certification requirements confront teacher candidates in an increasing number of states.

Because quality education begins with quality teaching, the area of teacher training must become a top priority for the state's institutions of higher education. We must make available more and better teachers. Needed improvements will require more than the "staff development" activities normally associated with universities. Planning, management, and evaluation of changes must involve all aspects of universities, public schools, and the public. Because of the documented decline in academic performance of secondary school students, and in the declining ability level of those college students who choose teacher education programs, universities must strengthen the general education core for all students, teacher education majors included. It appears that our concern for opening the doors of higher education to more students may be taking precedence over the equally important requirement to admit to teacher education intelligent and articulate candidates. Although there may not be a one-to-one relationship between intellectual ability and teacher effectiveness in the classroom, persons without such ability will be ineffective.

At the very minimum, efforts directed at improving the quality of our teachers must include a consideration of size, composition, and intellectual quality of the total pool from which teacher education majors are drawn. Measures of academic ability, first, and mastery of the professional methodology designed to improve competence in the classroom, are essential for the improvement of the teaching occupation.

The formation by the General Assembly of a permanent committee to study and monitor teacher education programs was a positive step. The following recommendations respond directly to the concerns cited in the public hearings and are hereby commended to the Teacher Education, Certification and Evaluation Committee.

Recommendation 18:

A. The university presidents and chancellors should take an active role in promoting and facilitating the sharing of responsibility and involvement by other appropriate divisions of the institution in teacher education. A Teacher Education Committee should be established at each institution composed jointly of persons representing the subject matter content disciplines and of persons representing teacher education. The purpose of the committee would be to recommend curriculum content and the general process of educating prospective teachers.

B. The foundation of all teacher education programs should be a strong general education program. All teacher education majors should take, as a minimum, the same general education courses recommended for all baccalaureate degree programs.

C. The education courses, especially for elementary education majors, should be revised to recognize the content of the recommended general education courses so that the professional education content is taught only at the upper level.

D. At the freshman and sophomore levels, teacher education majors should experience only a brief introduction to teacher education, exposure to teaching situations through observation and experience, and testing for aptitude and ability to become a teacher.

E. Specialization (certification) requirements and curricula for teacher education candidates should be carefully reviewed to determine whether there should be less or different emphases on methods and techniques. All teaching candidates should pursue in-depth study in one field sufficient to pursue graduate study. A full major in a discipline should be required of secondary teaching candidates.

F. Credit for student teaching experiences should be commensurate with the time spent in supervised classroom teaching. Requiring a full semester of student teaching should be given a high priority within the teacher education program. All student teaching experiences should be supervised by master teachers who are selected, trained, and appropriately compensated for that service.

G. Pre-packaged teacher training programs (such as the Program for Effective Teaching, Assertive Discipline, etc.), when used, should be in place of and not in addition to existing methods course hours in the pre-service curriculum; if such programs do not duplicate existing course content, appropriate credit hours should be awarded.

H. In order to identify and eliminate weaknesses, all teacher education candidates entering schools of education should be

evaluated for competency in written and oral communications not later than the junior year.

I. Instruction in basic school law, including individual and institutional liability, responsibility and duty, should be incorporated into undergraduate teacher education programs.

J. Classroom teachers should be encouraged through the certification process to complete masters degrees. Credit on the salary scale should not be given to classroom teachers for masters degrees obtained after July 1, 1987 which are not related to the area being taught. In no case should credit be given for a masters degree if granted by a program not then accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting association.

K. All professional staff in college programs of teacher education should have a substantial teaching or other appropriate experience (e.g., 120 hours) in a primary or secondary school setting at least every four years.

L. All initial teacher certifications should be provisional; permanent certification should be granted only after a specified provisional period and upon the recommendation of a team consisting of a public school administrator, a public school master teacher, and a college or university faculty member.

M. All teaching candidates should pass the basic core general education curriculum test or a state-validated basic skills test prior to admission to teacher education programs.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

Faculty Preparation and Qualifications

In many ways the quality of an institution of higher education is a direct function of the quality of its faculty. Having outstanding, well qualified faculty members will improve the quality of existing programs and of new programs, as well as encouraging the highest standards of students. One of the indicators of the quality of an institution's faculty can be found in their preparation.

There are many measures of quality of faculty preparation but the one most often used is the percent of an institution's faculty holding doctoral degrees. In four-year institutions, an average of 65.9% of the faculty hold doctoral degrees. Individual figures range from approximately 45% to 75%. Eight of the nine four-year schools experienced a steadily increasing percent of faculty with doctoral degrees over the past five years.

In comparing Arkansas colleges with those in seven similar states in the southern region, Arkansas consistently ranks among the top three in terms of the percent of faculty holding doctoral degrees. The only exception is found

among institutions offering the baccalaureate degree only. Arkansas institutions in this category, with an average of 51.8% of their faculty holding doctorates, rank considerably below similar institutions in other states.

Because of their mission, two-year colleges present a different picture. Currently, an average of 13% of the faculty, ranging from 8.8% to 29.6%, at two-year schools hold doctoral degrees. The trends at two-year schools over the past five years have also differed. Some have experienced increases and other have decreased. The average change for all two-year programs reflects a 2% decline in the percent of faculty with doctoral degrees. Since two-year colleges generally are more focused on the teaching mission, the QHESC does not find this to be an immediate concern.

Recruitment is an essential part of any faculty development plan. The more higher education administrators consider the educational problems they face, the more clearly they realize that their institutions cannot function successfully unless they are fully and competently staffed. In recruiting and assigning faculty members to positions, colleges and universities should be sensitive to the qualifications and competencies of the applicants. Faculty should be selected for potential teaching competence and performance aptitude.

Recommendation 19:

A. Institutions should examine the composition of their faculties annually to ensure that they support the mission of the institution. When an institution finds a mismatch, it should take immediate steps to alleviate the problem. This may involve recruitment or it may involve an institution's allocation of funds to support the existing faculty's pursuit of the skills appropriate to the institution's needs.

B. All four-year colleges and universities should continue to increase the number of faculty members holding terminal degrees, normally the doctorate, with a 10-year goal of 80% for doctoral institutions, 70% for masters institutions, and 60% for baccalaureate institutions.

Annual Evaluation

Virtually all institutions, two-year and four-year alike, currently have some type of formal annual faculty evaluation. In some cases the evaluation procedures are institution-wide and in some cases college- or school-wide. Four-year institutions have the most well developed and widely promulgated procedures. Two-year institutions often rely on an annual evaluation by a dean or the president.

Four-year institutions generally use the formal annual evaluation as a major source of information for annual salary recommendations. These recommendations are based on some combination of teaching, research, and service usually weighted in accordance with the institution's primary mission. While the four-year schools differ somewhat, all weight teaching highest (range of 35% to 75%) and generally weight research second and service third. Only one four-year school weights cost of living as a significant factor in annual raises.

Two-year schools do not, for the most part, use annual evaluations to determine specific salary recommendations. Rather, they use the evaluations to make contract renewal decisions and follow a salary schedule based on experience/longevity, degree of training, or some combination of these factors.

As would be expected, four-year schools show a significant range in their annual raises while two-year schools typically do not. For example, an average four-year school may routinely have up to a 10% difference between its highest and lowest raise. Only one two-year school reported a difference larger than 3%.

Most of the existing merit evaluation systems have been developed over the past five years. Over half of the institutions are at the present time examining and fine-tuning their systems. A significant number of two-year schools report that since gross salary inequities have, in some measure, been addressed in the recent past, they are exploring mechanisms to include specific merit considerations in their annual salary recommendations.

If institutions are to improve, or even maintain, the quality of their programs, it will have to be through the daily efforts of their faculties. Because of the central importance of teaching in higher education, special efforts should be made in the institutions to obtain information directly related to classroom performance by faculty members.

Recommendation 20:

A. Four-year institutions should continue their practice of differentially rewarding each year those faculty whose academic merit assist the institution in achieving the goals of higher education - teaching, research, and service. Such institutions should develop, by 1989, an annual compensation recommendation system based completely on merit.

B. Two-year institutions should continue their contract renewal evaluation and, by 1989, implement a system with annual salary recommendations based on a merit component and a salary schedule component.

C. Institutions should continually monitor their evaluation systems to ensure that they promote and reward those areas of faculty performance which maximize the specific stated goals and missions of such institutions.

D. Institutions should utilize classroom evaluations from students, from colleagues, and from supervisors. In addition to the student evaluations usually done, all classroom instructors should receive, at least once each semester, class visitation from a team composed of peers and a departmental chairperson or other appropriate supervisory staff.

E. Each institution should develop a formal system for evaluating administrative and other non-faculty personnel. This system should be tailored to the individual needs and missions of each institution but should, at a minimum, require that

annual salary recommendations be based on the results of a formal evaluation done in accordance with publicly established guidelines and criteria. As in the case of the faculty evaluations, broad input, including faculty, other administrators, and students where appropriate, should be sought in this annual evaluation system.

Promotion

As mentioned earlier, faculty in Arkansas institutions routinely receive annual evaluations which form the basis either for salary increases or for contract renewals. These evaluations generally focus on a faculty member's achievements in teaching, research, and service over one year. Institutions of higher education also periodically examine and evaluate a faculty member's development over a longer period to determine if his/her overall record of accomplishment matches the goals and objectives of the institution. This periodic evaluation provides an opportunity for the institution to require accountability from its professional staff as well as rewarding those who best exemplify its educational ideals. Traditionally, this periodic evaluation occurs through the promotion process.

All Arkansas four-year institutions have formal procedures for promotion evaluation. Those promotion policies are, for the most part, included in written public documents and, in a very real sense, serve as the basic set of professional and educational expectations for faculty. Two-year colleges, however, with one exception, have no faculty ranks and promotions are not a part of normal personnel procedures.

While promotion procedures vary somewhat from institution to institution, there are basic similarities. First, the promotion review is generally initiated by a department chairman and/or a faculty member after a period of from four to seven years in a faculty rank. Second, all four-year institutions in Arkansas utilize multiple reviews from the departmental level, both chairpersons and peers, from college-wide committees, from deans, and from chief executive officers. Third, most use evaluation information gathered from students, peers, and, in three institutions, evaluations from neutral referees at comparable institutions across the country. Fourth, all Arkansas institutions base the promotion evaluation on the criteria of teaching, research, and service. These criteria are generally weighted according to each institution's mission but in every case teaching receives the highest weighting with research next, and service usually a somewhat distant third. Last, all institutions seem to recognize the critical importance of this formal evaluation in that most institutions review and revise their policies periodically. In point of fact, all have been revised and updated in the past five years and half of the four-year schools have revised their policies in the past two years.

Recommendation 21:

A. Since the promotion procedure is one of the most important elements in gaining and maintaining a quality educational experience for Arkansas students, all four-year institutions should maintain and continually monitor the quality of their promotion evaluation procedures.

B. Self-study and self-review are critical to long term quality. All four-year schools should involve the broadest participation in the evaluation process. Students, colleagues, and supervisors can all provide important data to assist in this review.

C. If the institutions are to seek salary parity with comparable regional or national institutions, it is incumbent on them to demonstrate parity in the quality of their faculty and of their programs. Each four-year college should develop a list of peer institutions similar in goals, objectives, and overall missions, and routinely send selected portions of each faculty member's promotion documentation for outside review and comment.

D. The four-year institutions should be encouraged to select as reviewers other institutions that have stronger programs and may, therefore, serve as role models in gradually increasing faculty expectations and aspirations. Through outside review, the institutions will be able to systematically monitor their standards in comparison with regional and national peer institutions and better demonstrate the high quality of the educational experience.

E. Two-year colleges should form a statewide task force to examine alternate ways of providing long term evaluation of their faculty. This task force should make recommendations to ADHE for a system of periodic reviews, analogous to the system used for promotion review in the four-year schools. The purpose of this review would be to provide two-year colleges with procedures whereby senior faculty could be given the opportunity to receive substantial step salary increases every five to seven years in addition to their annual salary increments.

F. Because of the different missions of the two-year colleges, the review procedure and criteria may differ substantially from the promotion procedures used in four-year schools. However different the procedures may be, they should allow the two-year colleges to better demonstrate and reward the quality of their professional faculty and staff.

Tenure

Academic tenure, a policy which exists in institutions of higher education, is poorly understood by the general public and by many in higher education as well. Tenure has been described as a means to provide freedom for teaching, scholarship, and extramural activities as well as a means to provide sufficient economic security to attract faculty of quality. In virtually all four-year academic institutions, tenure exists as an earned privilege after a period of probationary employment.

All four-year institutions in Arkansas have tenure privileges available to their faculty. All four-year institutions, except one, have formal institution-wide written policies and procedures to evaluate faculty and to grant tenure. The evaluation process closely mirrors the promotion process described above. All Arkansas tenure considerations involve multiple levels of evaluations - departmental, college, dean, and chief academic officers - and seek input from student, departmental, and college peers. For each tenure consideration, one institution utilized neutral evaluators from comparable peer institutions across the country. In Arkansas the average probationary period is approximately six years and the criteria for awarding tenure include demonstrated excellence in teaching, research, and service. Once again, teaching is most heavily weighted but the exact weighting generally matches each institution's mission. While the exact data are difficult to gather, approximately 50-60% of the faculty in four-year institutions are granted tenure. Normally, faculty not receiving tenure seek other employment before their seventh year.

Tenure is much less common at two-year colleges. In Arkansas, only three two-year institutions have tenure provisions. When present, tenure consideration at two-year institutions closely matches that at four-year schools although teaching excellence and, to a much lesser extent, service to the community and to the institution are the major criteria.

The QHESC recognizes the importance of tenure in providing academic freedom to faculty and guaranteeing that institutions are able to attract and retain faculty members in a national market. It also recognizes, however, that tenure is a much misunderstood policy. It does not mean lifelong employment security independent of any other considerations. The following recommendations are not intended to suggest a periodic renewal of tenure. Rather, the purpose is to provide an opportunity to periodically reward faculty for past performance and allow them to match their individual goals and objectives with those of their institutions.

Recommendation 22:

A. In addition to the annual faculty evaluation, tenure-granting institutions should develop policies and procedures for longer term evaluation of tenured members of their faculties. Evaluation periods of five to seven years would allow institutions to demonstrate their concern for accountability as well as provide an opportunity to reward senior faculty. The periodic reviews should be directed toward allowing faculty members to demonstrate the quality of their records but, more importantly, to be an opportunity for them to outline multi-year individual development plans which will promote growth across the entire faculty.

B. As a result of these reviews, institutions should award special merit salary increases, analogous to raises which accompany promotions, to outstanding faculty. These periodic evaluations could serve as a mechanism whereby senior faculty salaries could, over time, remain in a more favorable position relative to the job market, particularly for outstanding faculty.

Faculty and Administration Salaries

Faculty salaries. Faculty in Arkansas institutions receive, on the average, among the lowest salaries in the country. Table 6 compares the average salaries at Arkansas institutions with those at comparable institutions in 13 states which comprise the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB).

TABLE 6. AVERAGE ARKANSAS AND REGIONAL SALARIES BY TYPE OF ARKANSAS INSTITUTION, 1982-83

	Doctoral	Masters I	Masters II	Baccal.	Two-Year
Ark. Average	$28,858	$23,482	$22,119	$20,382	$18,645
SREB Average	29,902	24,897	23,906	22,407	20,621
Ark. Rank in Region	8	7	11	9	9
Ark. Institutions	UAF	ASU UALR UCA	ATU HSU SAU	UAM UAPB	ASUB EACC GCCC MCCC NACC PCCC RMCC SAUE SAUT WCC

Arkansas institutions, regardless of the level of degrees granted, consistently rank in the lower half of southern states, states which typically have the lowest average salaries when compared to states in other regions. Table 7 gives a clearer picture of these salary differentials.

TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF ARKANSAS, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES FOR THREE FACULTY RANKS, 1982-83

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Ark. Average	$30,436	$24,380	$21,020
SREB Average	34,733	26,787	22,118
National Average	35,956	27,262	22,586
Comparison of Arkansas to:			
SREB Average	-14.1%	-9.8%	-5.2%
Nat. Average	-18.1%	-11.8%	-7.5%

Faculty salaries at Arkansas institutions range from 7.5% to 18.1% below the national average and from 5.2% to 14.1% below the average of the 13 SREB states. Moreover, an examination of Table 7 shows that the salary discrepancy gets progressively greater with each increase in academic rank from assistant professor through full professor. Thus, with each promotion, faculty at Arkansas institutions lose ground significantly when compared with their peers nationally and regionally.

Average faculty salaries do not, in and of themselves, directly speak to the quality of a student's educational experience. In fact, Arkansas has been very fortunate to have as high a quality of faculty as it does. As one person said in the QHESC public hearings, ". . .the money spent on higher education in Arkansas is the 'best' money the state spends." Continued salary inequities, however, will over time, have a deleterious effect on the quality of higher education. While the average salary figure reported in Table 7 does allow institutions to be relatively competitive in attracting newly trained faculty, the increasing disparity at the higher ranks will most certainly encourage older, mature faculty to seek the higher financial rewards available in other states. Arkansas must recognize that this loss of human resources involves a loss of the best of our academic faculty whose training, skills, and records of performance make them most attractive to other institutions. By hiring Arkansas' time-tested and proven teachers and scholars, other states are able to let Arkansas provide the "risk" capital for young faculty and attract them by offering only their institutional average salary which will almost always represent a significant salary increase for Arkansas faculty.

Recommendation 23:

A. A plan should be established, and funding provided, to increase the average faculty salary at all institutions with the goal of attaining parity with national averages by the 1990/91 academic year. An interim goal should be parity with the SREB states no later than the 1986/87 academic year.

B. The plan should recognize that the greatest need exists at the higher faculty ranks. The increments in meeting national and SREB salary averages should be implemented in addition to the yearly increments generally built into the budget.

Administration salaries. The President/Chancellor position maximum currently ranges from $53,300 to $74,114 at the four-year institutions depending on the size and mission of the institution. The Dean position maximum ranges from $39,937 to $58,810. These maximums and those between are simply not competitive with similar institutions in other states. A 1984 study of the compensation of university chief executives found that the average was $70,700. The average for those in institutions with budgets over $100,000,000 was $83,500. In a comparision with Arkansas salaries, UAF, with a budget of over $124,000,000, has a $66,149 maximum salary for its Chancellor, a figure 21% lower than the national average. Similar disparities occur for the other institutions.

Recommendation 24:

Salaries should be set for all administrative personnel at levels competitive with national average salaries at comparable institutions.

Faculty and Staff Development

Since the shock of Sputnik in the late 1950's, the time, energy, and financial resources devoted to scientific and technological advances have grown steadily. In the late-1960's, Alvin Toffler's book, Future Shock, documented for many Americans the breadth of change and that the explosion of knowledge in the sciences was being repeated in other fields. The information explosion is now accepted as a fact of life. What is often not considered, however, is the impact that this has on higher education. In some fields, for example, it is estimated that the half-life of knowledge may be as short as five to seven years. This means that half of the knowledge in that field has been produced within the past five to seven years. Given the national trend of progressively limited faculty mobility and turnover in higher education with the resultant aging of faculty within each institution of higher education, the need for staff development will continue to grow.

These trends have unmistakable consequences for Arkansas institutions. If students are to learn the latest knowledge, techniques, and technologies, faculty must remain current in their fields and be able to provide state-of-the-art knowledge in the classroom as well as in the laboratory.

Both two-year and four-year institutions are responding to this challenge. All of the four-year institutions have some policy to assist faculty in improving, upgrading, or modifying their skills; slightly under half of the two-year colleges have formal policies. Assistance may come as sabbatical leaves, travel assistance, summer stipends, tuition assistance, or other forms. This assistance may be directed toward improvement in a faculty member's field of knowledge or toward support of a research program. Virtually all institutions provide some funds for faculty to attend professional meetings or workshops and most provide financial assistance to faculty who are continuing their education. A few institutions have designated staff or human resource development offices to monitor and coordinate the faculty development effort.

Faculty development programs are a critical key in the maintenance and improvement of quality in institutions of higher education. In the past, staff development programs have been classed as low priority programs and, thus, have received few funds. In general, this low priority status has been maintained during the present high competition for budget dollars. Staff development programs must be given much higher priority than they are receiving at the present time. Unless the urgency and magnitude of this need is recognized immediately and support made available for staff development programs, the full potential of the institutions will be unrealized.

Recommendation 25:

A. Over the next two years each institution should formally examine its current level of faculty and staff development

effort and determine if that level is sufficient to meet the future demands given the demographic and substantive composition of the faculty. This examination, which should have faculty, administrative, and student input, should result in an institutional policy which specifies the percent of institutional resources to be expended on such development and the proportion of staff who will be affected over a five-year period. Once developed, this plan should be reexamined and revised every five years.

B. Every faculty and staff member in every institution should have a professional development plan, individually tailored in terms of the goals and resources of the college and the scholarly needs of the individual involved. Such plans should be developed in consultation with appropriate college officials and should form the basis for faculty and staff evaluation.

Personnel Turnover

In the section on faculty and administration salaries, the disparity between salaries at Arkansas institutions and at institutions both in the southern region and nationally is documented. It is suggested that among the problems which might result from such disparities, the problem of faculty and administrator turnover is perhaps the most serious. The extent of this turnover was documented in a paper by Dr. Gary Chamberlin, Director of the ADHE, in 1983. Chamberlin stated that the "single most critical component of the education effort" is the faculty. He argued that because higher education is so labor-intensive both the quality and the stability of personnel are more important to the educational enterprise than to most other organizations.

Stability, however, has not characterized Arkansas institutions over the past few years. Chamberlin reported that 1,238 full-time faculty left their positions in Arkansas for employment elsewhere between 1977-78 and 1981-82. He estimated that currently an average of as high as 10% is leaving each year. In another article, Chamberlin reported that the turnover in higher education was not limited to faculty but was found among top administrators as well. He found that in the 113 year history of state-supported higher education, the 20 Arkansas campuses have had slightly over 100 presidents and chancellors. Unbelievably, almost half, 42%, have served in the past 10 years and 30 have served in the past five years.

Obviously, turnover, whether at the faculty or at the administrative level, is not, in and of itself, bad. New faculty, as well as new leadership, can be quite beneficial. But, when 10% of the faculty move each year and when 30 different chief executives are required to staff 20 different institutions in five years, the problem of turnover should be viewed as epidemic.

The QHESC believes that existing policies and practices must be changed to reduce the amount of staff turnover currently being experienced in Arkansas. Reversing the trend of using Arkansas as a proving ground for faculty and for administrators will be difficult and a variety of strategies must be tried if Arkansas is to achieve stability in its institutions. Some will require additional funding and some will only require changes in policies and procedures.

Recommendation 26:

Beginning with the 1984-85 academic year, all institutions should routinely conduct exit interviews for all staff resigning from faculty or administrative positions. At a minimum, the interview should determine the reason for the resignation, the name of the institution and the area to which the individual is moving, the type of new employment, and, if available, the entry level salary. A summary report of the results of these interviews should be submitted by each President or Chancellor to the ADHE by September 15 of each year.

Faculty Workload

The question of faculty workload is one which has in recent years attracted considerable attention. Faculty members are generally responsible for three areas of endeavor: teaching, research, and service. The emphasis varies with the individual institution and the specified field.

Studies have shown that the average work week for a faculty member is 50 to 60 hours. The classroom contact hours of a faculty member, however, represents only a portion of this total. About two-thirds of a typical faculty member's work week is spent in classroom instruction, preparation, advising, and related duties; the remainder is spent in administrative tasks, research, professional improvement, public service, outside consulting, governance committees, and numerous other activities connected with his/her position.

Teaching has traditionally been the principal task of the professor and continues to be the highest priority. Although knowledge of the material by the instructor is a necessary condition for good teaching, it is not the only one, since teaching involves a mastery of communication skills which are independent of any particular academic discipline. This means that lectures must not only be erudite, but also understandable, both in content and delivery.

Research and service receive a somewhat lower priority than teaching at Arkansas institutions. All four-year colleges, however, encourage their faculty to engage in some research and scholarship to support the teaching mission, the training of graduate students, or the production of knowledge in specific fields of study. In addition, most universities regard research as a critically important factor in making promotion and/or tenure decisions. Faculty service workloads vary considerably depending upon the type of institution and a faculty member's academic field. While the assessment of service is often difficult, it is an important function of colleges and universities and provides a major mechanism through which communities can avail themselves of the far reaching resources present on college campuses.

The QHESC generally endorses a guideline of 12-15 hour undergraduate and nine hour graduate teaching workloads. It also recognizes, however, that faculty workloads must be determined by each institution in accordance with its own particular mission and staff composition. Hence, baccalaureate-only institu-

tions may have larger average teaching loads than would an institution offering advanced graduate level training. Even within institutions, workloads may vary considerably based on faculty skills, qualifications, and institutional needs.

Recommendation 27:

A. Since teaching is the foremost function of any educational institution, all Arkansas students should have the opportunity to study under the best scholars available. Therefore, all graduate faculty should also be assigned to teach lower and upper division undergraduate courses.

B. Workloads should specifically include assignments for the advising function. If students are to be retained, they must receive adequate academic as well as career advising. Further, institutions should develop formal mechanisms to reward outstanding advisors.

C. Some research and/or scholarly activity should be a part of all faculty workloads at four-year institutions. In institutions with graduate programs, the research assignment may be directed toward basic or applied research consistent with the mission of the institution, while in other institutions the scholarly activity may be directed toward increasing a faculty member's knowledge in support of his/her teaching.

D. Institutions should, for some proportion of their faculty, include a formal community service assignment in the annual workload. If service is properly recognized and rewarded, it will promote an increasing responsiveness of educational institutions to the needs of the state and the local community.

E. Administrators should develop a means of regular contact with students, including, but not limited to, such means as: teaching (if at all possible), working with student groups, sponsoring student organizations, advising, and including students on advisory bodies reporting to them.

Part-Time Instruction and Graduate Assistants

Table 8 displays the percentage of student semester credit hours generated by all part-time faculty and teaching assistants in each institution.

TABLE 8. PERCENT OF STUDENT SEMESTER HOURS GENERATED BY PART-TIME FACULTY AND TEACHING ASSISTANTS AT ARKANSAS INSTITUTIONS, 1982-83

Institution	Percent	Institution	Percent
ASU	2.3	ASU-B	10.8
ATU	7.4	EACC	13.0
HSU	4.7	GCCC	20.0
SAU	5.9	MCCC	20.0
UAF	26.6	NACC	20.0
UALR	13.4	PCCC	13.0
UAM	6.3	SAU-E	13.4
UAPB	2.4	SAU-T	17.0
UCA	7.3	WCC	17.1

Relatively large percentages of student semester credit hours taught by part-time faculty or graduate assistants are noted at UAF and several of the community colleges. ASU has the smallest percentage, 2.3%, of student semester credit hours taught by part-time employees or graduate assistants among the institutions.

A poll of selected land-grant flagship institutions in the south and midwest shows an average of slightly over 24% of the student semester credit hours are taught by graduate teaching assistants. Where graduate students are utilized as part of the teaching staff, they are almost always used in multi-sectioned freshman level courses such as English, mathematics, speech, and foreign language. Since these courses are taken by virtually all students at a university, there is a substantial cost reduction since graduate students can be employed at a salary well under 50% of the average faculty member's salary.

Among the two-year institutions, the percentage of student semester credit hours taught by part-time faculty ranged from 10.8% at ASU-B to 20% at GCCC, MCCC, and NACC. The relatively large percentage of student semester credit hours taught by part-time faculty at two-year institutions may be due to a significant portion of students attending school at night.

The QHESC recognizes that there are many situations in the classroom and in the laboratory where teaching assistants and part-time personnel may be utilized. The classroom skills of all part-time personnel and graduate assistants should be comparable to those of full-time faculty.

Recommendation 28:

A. Each institution should develop a comprehensive method of selecting and evaluating part-time and graduate assistant personnel. Appropriate direction and supervision are necessary to ensure that students receive a high quality classroom experience. Graduate assistants being utilized as instructors should be observed in the classroom by supervising staff a minimum of four times each semester; part-time instructors should be observed at least once each semester. It is each institution's responsibility to ensure that no full-time

student has a majority of any semester's hours taught by other than full-time personnel.

B. Institutions should develop a plan which provides for the use of part-time faculty primarily for the purpose of providing selected expertise otherwise unavailable and which limits the use of such persons for merely "covering" courses in high demand disciplines.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Desegregation as a means for achieving equality of educational opportunity and improving educational outcomes for black Americans moved from primary and secondary school systems to higher education as a direct consequence of the mandate in Adams v. Richardson. It required that Arkansas and nine other states which had operated legally separate systems of higher education, one for blacks and one for whites, submit plans for the elimination of that duality. From the outset, the plans were to be designed to insure access and increased participation rates for blacks in all institutions of higher education and, therefore, to other aspects of American society. In addition to the overriding objective of Adams it was noted that HEW was not enforcing Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits federal support of public educational institutions that practice segregation and discrimination.

In 1973, the State of Arkansas submitted a desegregation plan for review by the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan, approved in 1974, included statewide and institutional goals for increasing minority students, faculty, and administrators in Arkansas institutions and specific objectives, strategies, and timetables for accomplishing the goals.

The QHESC recognizes that the institutions have concerns and obligations with respect to minority groups other than black persons and in no way suggests that those concerns or obligations be diminished. Because of the requirements of the Adams decision, the emphasis in these recommendations has been on black students and employees.

The term "minority presence" in the plans and in this report means black students attending traditionally white institutions and white students attending traditionally black institutions.

Employment

As a result of these plans, Arkansas institutions have employed a variety of techniques in the recruitment of black faculty and administrators. Each institution has recruited according to its own policies but there are many areas of similarity in the various strategies. These affirmative action steps, with some variation, are employed by all four-year institutions. Two-year institutions employ similar procedures although all do not routinely advertise nationally for positions. In addition, most institutions utilize special strategies to assist in affirmative action in employment. These policies and procedures have, in general, been in operation for the past five to eight

years. Institutions regularly add additional recruiting strategies as new techniques are discovered.

Based on the past six years of data, the affirmative action steps taken to desegregate faculty and administrators in Arkansas institutions have failed. This failure, however, is not unique to Arkansas. Recent reports have suggested that, nationally, no gains are being made in increasing minority staff representation in predominately white colleges. The core problem, many feel, is the small pool of minority group members available to colleges.

One of the most critical problems with which Arkansas must deal during the coming decade, then, is to increase the pool of candidates for higher level faculty and administrative positions. Less than 4% of all college and university professors are black and many of those are concentrated in the field of education. Further, there is little evidence that these figures will change in the near future. Nationally, only about 4% of all graduate enrollment is black. Of the doctorates granted in such fields as engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, and health sciences, less than 2% are awarded annually to blacks.

Perhaps the major obstacle which deters minority students from completing doctoral level training is financial disadvantage. Pursuing an academic career is an expensive proposition. A disproportionate number of black students lack the financial reserves to remain in school for an additional four years past the baccalaureate and, therefore, find it difficult to undertake a program of graduate education. Moreover, this situation is exacerbated when many receive financially attractive job offers after having been awarded the masters degree, especially in the more applied natural and social sciences.

Recommendation 29:

Because of the paucity of blacks in the pool of candidates available to colleges and universities, Arkansas should adopt a statewide plan to develop additional black Ph.D.'s within the Arkansas higher education system. This plan should include a partnership of institutions with the General Assembly in an Arkansas Doctoral Fellow Program. Candidates for this program should come from two sources - black faculty and administrators currently employed in Arkansas institutions and black students graduating from Arkansas institutions with baccalaureate or masters degrees.

In carrying out this recommendation, two distinct parts should be developed and, for purposes of this report, are entitled "Faculty/Adminstrator Fellows" and "Arkansas Alumni Fellows".

Faculty/Administrator Fellows. Black Arkansas faculty and administrators should be selected to attend doctoral granting institutions, in residence, while continuing to receive full pay and allowances in the form of doctoral fellowships from their institutions. Faculty and administrators selected for this program should be required to commit to teaching full-time for three years in their sponsoring institution after participating in the program.

The following additional criteria should be considered when making selections:

1. At least two years of full-time service at the sponsoring institutions prior to beginning the program.

2. Priority for fellows in those fields in which blacks are most underrepresented.

3. Priority for fellows who have in the past made the most progress in a doctoral program and will thus require minimum time away from their employing institutions.

Fellows selected for the program would be responsible for all costs associated with their educational programs. No more than two persons per institution should be permitted to participate in the program at any one time.

Arkansas Alumni Fellows. Black baccalaureate and masters level candidates from Arkansas institutions should be selected during their last year of study to attend doctoral granting institutions to complete a graduate program. Alumni fellows would receive a fellowship stipend equal to the highest stipend offered in the doctoral program they would be attending, plus full tuition, fees, and books, at the graduate institution. Alumni Fellows should commit to teaching full-time for two years at their sponsoring institution after completing their doctoral study and be compensated at a salary competitive with others at the institution.

The following criteria should be considered when selecting participating fellows:

1. A cumulative G.P.A. of at least 3.25, or a cumulative G.P.A. of at least 3.00 and a G.P.A. in the major field of at least 3.50.

2. Priority for fellows in those fields in which blacks are most underrepresented.

3. Priority based on the national rankings of the graduate programs to which the students are admitted.

Alumni fellows would be responsible for all costs associated with their educational programs over and above the tuition, fees, and books. No more than four fellows per four-year institution should be permitted to participate in the program at any one time.

The costs for these programs should be shared equally by the General Assembly and the institutions.

Recommendation 30:

The General Assembly should set aside a special fund to reimburse participating institutions for 50% of the cost of the fellowship programs. These funds should be used to partially reimburse institutions for the costs involved in replacing faculty and administrators while on leave to complete their doctoral studies.

Enrollment

During the approximately 10 years of implementation of the state desegregation plan, Arkansas institutions have attracted a larger proportion of black students. The greatest improvement took place during the early part of the implementation period and has stabilized or declined in more recent years. Table 9 shows the percent of black students enrolled at all public institutions and at the traditionally white public institutions since 1974-75.

TABLE 9. PERCENT OF BLACK ENROLLMENT IN ARKANSAS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1974-75 THROUGH 1983-84

Year	Traditionally White Institutions	All Institutions
1974-75	9.2	12.7
1975-76	10.8	14.4
1976-77	12.5	16.9
1977-78	11.7	16.2
1978-79	11.4	15.5
1979-80	11.8	15.6
1980-81	12.0	15.7
1981-82	11.9	15.4
1982-83	11.6	14.7
1983-84	11.6	14.6

The state established a goal of 16% black enrollment at traditionally white institutions. Table 9 shows that growth was generally experienced until the late 1970's and has gradually declined during the 1980's, a trend that appears to be taking place throughout the country. It is apparent that if Arkansas is to meet the goal established, efforts different than those currently in place must be tried.

It is generally accepted that many black students are discouraged from attending college because of a lack of financial resources. The QHESC believes meeting the commitment made in the desegregation plan and to the black citizens of the state is of such importance to require exceptional methods in encouraging a larger proportion of black high school graduates to enroll in college, particularly at traditionally white institutions. At the same time, more white students must be encouraged to view UAPB as a regional university suitable for meeting their educational needs.

These objectives could be met, at least in part, by establishing a central clearing house for information about attending college and creating a unique "minority presence" student financial assistance program for Arkansas residents attending Arkansas institutions.

Recommendation 31:

A. The ADHE should establish and be funded to maintain an Educational Opportunities Information Center responsible for

the publication and dissemination of all statewide recruitment materials and for the coordination of institutional efforts to increase generally the college-going rate of Arkansas citizens.

B. Undergraduate

Funds should be provided state institutions to enable them to grant minority presence scholarships. Students at a given institution who rank in the top 40% of their high school graduating classes should be awarded aid which, when combined with any other institutional scholarships, would not exceed the amount of tuition and fees. The minority presence scholarships should be renewable for four years if the student's grade point average remains above 2.8. Scholarships should be restricted to Arkansas residents attending state-supported institutions of higher education in Arkansas.

C. Masters

Scholarships should be provided directly to graduate students who attend graduate programs at state-supported institutions in Arkansas in which the students are in the racial minority. Scholarships should be based on academic qualifications, in the amount of tuition and fees, and renewable for one additional year.

D. Doctoral, Law, and Medicine

Scholarships should be provided to selected minority presence graduate scholars who are Arkansas residents to allow them to pursue studies at state-supported institutions in Arkansas in the fields of law and medicine, and for the doctorate in fields in which black participation has been historically low, e.g., engineering and physical sciences. Each scholarship should provide an annual stipend plus tuition and fees, up to three years for the doctorate and law and four years for medicine.

E. Funds should be provided to ADHE to be apportioned annually for the following year.

RESOURCES AND GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS

Higher Education as a Priority in State Financial Resources

It is widely recognized that general development of the economy of the entire state of Arkansas must be a priority in coming years if the individual citizens are to have the opportunity for gainful employment and economic security. All indications are that higher education will have a growing role in economic development through increasing both the quantity and quality of education provided. That means that higher education must be a priority in those financial resources available to the state in the future.

TABLE 10. HIGHER EDUCATION OPERATING FUNDS RECEIVED AS A PERCENT OF DISTRIBUTABLE GENERAL REVENUES, 1974/75 THROUGH 1983/84.

Fiscal Year	General Revenue	Higher Education	Percent
1974/75	$ 464,247,144	$ 85,138,879	18.34
1975/76	523,591,069	93,481,949	17.85
1976/77	591,391,503	106,384,168	17.99
1977/78	677,662,806	124,657,086	18.40
1978/79	751,776,592	138,433,259	18.41
1979/80	853,481,726	154,729,510	18.13
1980/81	908,638,558	162,824,890	17.92
1981/82	969,650,376	174,107,004	17.96
1982/83	1,023,649,335	181,697,896	17.75
1983/84	1,191,160,313	192,933,677	16.16

In the past 10 years, the percentage of general revenues received by the institutions has declined. Table 10 shows that the institutions received 18.34% of distributable state general revenues in 1974/75 but only 16.16% in 1983/84, in spite of the fact that nearly 20,000 more students were being served. The priority should significantly improve in 1984/85 because of the support of the Governor and General Assembly during the extraordinary legislative session of 1983, but it will most likely still remain at 17.0% or lower. Had the 1974/75 priority remained, the institutions would have received over $25,000,000 more in 1983/84.

Recommendation 32:

The General Assembly should avoid reducing the priority on higher education in the allocation of general revenues in times of declining tax collections, and be aggressive in increasing the state's investment in higher education as circumstances permit.

Higher Education Budget Process

A formula system developed through the cooperative efforts of the ADHE and the institutions is the basis of the present budgeting process. Although the formulas are driven to a great extent by student enrollments, they also provide for differences among institutions. An institution may request funds by providing information indicating that additional expenditures are justified in certain areas not covered by the formulas.

The following steps are involved in the budgetary process:

1. Development of formulas by staff of the ADHE and institutional representatives.

2. Approval of formulas by the SBHE.

3. Institutional requests for funding to the staff.

4. Hearings by staff for institutional personnel.

5. Staff recommendations to the SBHE.

6. Hearings by the SBHE for institutional heads.

7. Adoption of final recommendations by the SBHE.

8. Presentation of recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly.

9. Appropriation of funds by the General Assembly to each institution.

When funds available for appropriation by the General Assembly are less than those recommended by the SBHE, the ADHE is usually asked to prepare recommended funding for each institution with the total for all institutions not to exceed the funds fixed by the Joint Budget Committee of the General Assembly.

Although certain line items are contained in the appropriation act for each institution, appropriations are generally made in broad categories which give institutions a certain amount of budgeting flexibility. Transfer of funds from one category to another is sometimes permitted. The Revenue Stabilization Act establishes procedures for distributing all state funds. Priorities are established which limit appropriations to available funds. This often means that institutions do not receive the total amount appropriated.

After institutions receive notification of appropriations and estimated general revenues for the year, operating budgets are revised. Expenditures within these budgets are controlled by the Boards of Trustees of the institutions within limits established by the General Assembly and numerous regulatory agencies. Salaries must fall within established line item maximums. Purchasing must be accomplished through various state purchasing contracts and regulations. Pre-audits by the Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration of purchases and professional service contracts are required.

Recommendation 33:

The formula approach to appropriation requests is reasonable, thorough and equitable, and should be continued. Consideration of Justification Items, those institutional needs not accommodated by the various formulas, should also be continued. Appropriations should continue to be made to institutions in the same proportion as the final recommendations of the SBHE.

Management Responsibility and Flexibility

Amendment 33 to the State Constitution vests the authority for management of the state-supported institutions in the Boards of Trustees. As the agents designated by Boards of Trustees, presidents and chancellors are the chief operating officers held responsible for the quality of educational programs and

services and the daily operation and the management of public resources under guidelines as established by the state and the various boards. Annual audits of expenditures are conducted by Legislative Audit to determine if all procedures have been followed and to hold the institutions accountable for such expenditures.

Maintaining an appropriate balance between decision-making that should take place at the institutions and that in which the state has a justifiable interest for the sake of quality improvement is a difficult task. During the public hearings conducted by the QHESC, repeated instances of problems in maintaining this balance were cited. Although purchasing, computerized equipment acquisition, the approval of contracts, budget management, and many others were mentioned, the far greatest concern involved personnel.

Presently, employees of institutions, other than administrators and faculty, are regulated by the State Employees Classification and Pay Plan. Serious limitations are imposed upon employment practices and the institutions find that the present classification system often does not adequately relate to program quality and to most institutional positions. One striking example was that a university often must attempt to employ a highly qualified person to fill a responsible position while limiting the salary to the beginning step of the grade designated for that position. Other problems concerned the proper classification for positions, the inability to grant credit for previous experience in non-state employment, and the ability to grant increases based on merit.

In addition to the average faculty salary increase recommended earlier, a basic change in the line item maximum regulations for non-classified personnel is needed. Under current appropriations practices, maximums are specified for each faculty rank. Section 10 of Act 147 of 1983 allows for the possibility of up to 10% of the faculty positions to receive up to 25% compensation above the stated maximum. No such provision exists for non-faculty positions and more flexibility in both of these areas is needed.

Recommendation 34:

A. Administrators should be given both the responsibility and the authority to successfully manage their institutions with additional flexibility in purchasing, personnel, and other matters having to do with daily institutional management.

B. Methods should be found for directing appropriated funds to the various institutions in a manner which provides incentives and rewards for good management practices. Institutions should be permitted, within reasonable limits, to transfer funds from one line item in the appropriations act to another.

C. Modifications should be made in the State Employees Classification and Pay Plan to provide much-needed flexibility. For example, permission should be granted to hire entry level personnel at higher steps without state agency approval, to give experience credit for employment outside state

government, and to recognize and reward outstanding employees on the basis of merit.

D. In providing greater flexibility in attracting and retaining the highest quality faculty and administrative staff, the line item maximum regulations in appropriation acts should be changed to include a maximum average for each faculty rank and administrative category rather than the present maximum for any one individual within a category.

Libraries

While libraries have always served as a critically important resource to education, the information explosion which has occurred over the past 25 years and is continuing to occur at an exponential rate necessitates that libraries be allocated special priorities in future funding processes. Since much of a field's knowledge will have been created since the average faculty member was trained or since the last piece of equipment was purchased, libraries become the mechanism through which students learn past as well as current knowledge, through which faculty engage in the scholarly work which supports their research as well as their teaching, and through which the economic sector and the general public have access to state-of-the-art developments.

The emphasis in libraries is shifting from collections to access. Providing access to information will be the principal goal and activity, and coping with technology and change will be principal driving forces of the emerging information-age library. Information-processing technologies will increase the importance and enlarge the role and capabilities of the academic library. Users will no longer be limited to what a library has, but to what it can provide. Although resource-sharing will be a supplement to, it will not be a substitute for, strong working collections in libraries. The electronic dimension cannot be developed at the expense of the traditional, as print materials must coexist with information in electronic form for at least another two decades. Libraries must begin to develop the capacity to acquire and make available to users selected files and collections of research data and more information in electronic form. These services will cost more in the future than they do now, but they will be far more effective.

Deficiencies in the libraries of Arkansas postsecondary institutions have been cited repeatedly by the North Central Association and other accrediting associations. While several libraries in the state have recently made strides toward meeting the minimum standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries, most are still below the level that students have the right to expect in pursuing their education and training for a career. A recent listing of the top 104 libraries in the United States did not include a single Arkansas library. Correcting these deficiencies must be a priority in future planning for higher education.

Recommendation 35:

A. Library holdings should be improved in state colleges and universities. Special funding should be made available to assist the institutional libraries in reaching the minimum

standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Specific holdings should, however, match the mission of each institution.

B. Each institution's normal operating budget should provide for a maintenance of effort, not to be offset or replaced by any supplemental funding, to further improve libraries.

C. A special incentive matching fund should be set up and become part of the library fund formulas to be allocated to those institutions making the most progress toward meeting and exceeding the minimum library standards.

D. The General Assembly should establish an information-technology task force to conduct a feasibility study of a state-wide, multi-type library networking system involving cooperation among academic, public school, and other information agencies. The task force should focus on information holdings with special attention to document delivery, networking, access to national data bases and other services that will link our citizens with what they want to know, through the widest means possible.

Research and Public Service

Baccalaureate institutions traditionally embrace a threefold statement of purpose including instruction, research, and public service with instruction appropriately having far the greatest emphasis. These three objectives are generally accepted within the higher education community and most commonly will appear in printed literature from the various institutions. Two-year institutions state instruction in academic transfer, vocational, and community service courses as their primary purpose. Two-year institutions rarely have as an objective any research activity or perform such research but public service is an emphasis through the community service function. As throughout the country, instruction is the highest calling in all institutions in Arkansas with research and public service secondary in importance.

Research. Society has long relied on higher education institutions for research results, a situation which has grown rapidly in recent years as technology has expanded, and which can be expected to continue unchecked into the next century. In fact, it is now clearly recognized that the future economic security of this and other nations will depend more and more heavily upon research as a basis for the development of new products and services. Because of the concentrations of highly educated individuals at college campuses, it can be easily predicted that higher education institutions will be expected to increase their emphasis on research.

Although the definitions are not totally clear, research activity is commonly classified in the two broad categories of "basic" and "applied". Basic research is generally identified as long-term and that which contributes to existing knowledge something not previously known. It is cumulative and results in major breakthroughs for the benefit of society, usually at infrequent intervals. Basic research is expensive, reaps its results from

patience and persistence, and generates less excitement except at those times when major discoveries are confirmed. A vaccine for polio was the result of basic research and, when a cure for cancer is discovered, it will be from basic research.

Applied research is more action oriented and searches for solutions to immediate problems in a variety of fields. Contributions to new knowledge may result but are not necessarily a primary objective. Rather, it has the objective of applying various combinations of existing knowledge to the solution of an immediate problem. Applied research is not necessarily cumulative, it is most often short-term, and it is usually not as expensive to perform as basic research. Except when there are major discoveries, applied research may generate more excitement than basic research because the results are more frequent, more practical in application, and more easily understood by the general public. It may be discovered that policy or procedural changes in a manufacturing plant results in greater productivity or reduced cost; that the learning of children is enhanced through a modified instructional technique; that changes in farming operations may increase crop yields; or that certain characteristics within family settings are major factors in criminal activity of individuals. All of these and many others are examples of the results of applied research. While basic research will provide the new products and services, applied research will determine their production, organization, and use.

Because of the expense involved for laboratories, equipment, and support services, Arkansas should generally attempt to concentrate basic research at a limited number of locations, but every four-year institution should establish as a primary objective a considerably increased level of applied research activity. There will be faculty members at various institutions who, because of particular skills and interests, will occasionally secure grants or contracts for basic research projects and this should not be discouraged. The development of basic research as an institution-wide objective, however, should be primarily at the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas Medical Sciences campus. Every four-year institution should have an institution-wide objective of increased applied research activity among faculty members. In both cases, research involvement should be recognized as an element in promotion, tenure, and salary increases, but always secondary to the instructional obligation.

Recommendation 36:

A. While the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences should adopt institution-wide objectives of increased activity in basic research, all four-year institutions should adopt institition-wide objectives of increased activity in research by faculty members.

B. At all four-year institutions, research involvement should be recognized as an element in promotion, tenure, and salary increases, but always secondary to the instructional obligation.

Public service. Public service activities by higher education institutions even more than research, are not easily defined. In general, public service may be thought of as that collection of activities and programs which make available to the general public the human resources of an institution. Specific examples may be seminars or short courses frequently not offered for credit designed to update the knowledge of a specific group of people or for general interest, understanding, or pleasure. Many times such programs will be developed on request. Other examples would be consultant services or advice provided by an institution to governmental entities or private business. The Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Arkansas is a major public service agency whose service is designed to assist the agricultural community through dissemination of research results and improved agricultural production or management procedures.

Because of a lack of definition and the expense involved, institutions in Arkansas and throughout the country usually do not have well developed, comprehensive public service programs. As with research, it can be expected in the future that the general public will seek greater access to the resources of higher education institutions in conducting their business and in the mere living of their lives. Consulting services on a contract basis by various faculty members will not fulfill these demands. In institutions supported by public funds, increasing levels of public service will be expected as an institutional objective. Unless there is careful planning and definition between the institutions and those seeking services, expectations could easily exceed the ability of institutions to provide services without adversely affecting instruction and research programs.

All institutions, including two-year colleges, have a public service role to perform which should be affirmatively defined, designed, and carried out within the context of institutional resources. Successful programs will require that the reward system for faculty include recognition of public services provided.

Recommendation 37:

All institutions, including two-year colleges, should put greater emphasis on the public service role. Public service programs should be carefully defined within the resources available to institutions. Public service functions performed by faculty members under the auspices of the institutions should be recognized in promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

Creativity and Innovation

One of the most significant characteristics of the highest quality higher education institutions in America is the degree to which a climate of creativity and innovation is fostered. A concentration of highly educated individuals, by nature oriented toward creativity and innovation, who are discouraged by stifling rules, regulations, and a perceived lack of institutional or public interest in new ideas is a tragic waste of human resources. All indications are that the economic development of this country in the coming years will depend more on creative new ideas with market appeal than any other single factor. The colleges and universities of America will necessarily be called upon to generate many of those ideas.

A second benefit to a climate of new ideas on a college campus accrues to the students. In the long term, this may well turn out to be the greatest benefit. Faculty members who are encouraged in their creative thinking have a higher level of morale and excitement which manifests itself most obviously in the classroom. The very nature of the teaching process, which is the transmission of knowledge from one human being to another, becomes more alive and the students who graduate from an institution permeated with new ideas will be the business and government leaders of the future.

Arkansas has not taken a leadership role in encouraging idea generation in its higher education institutions in the past. During the special session of the General Assembly in 1983, however, Governor Clinton proposed a procedure new to Arkansas which was adopted by the General Assembly. The sum of $3,400,000, commonly known as "10/10 funds", was appropriated to the State Board of Higher Education to be made available on a competitive basis to the institutions in 1984/85 for various new programs and projects formally proposed by the institutions. Nearly 100 projects amounting to over $12,000,000 were submitted for consideration. Many more were developed and eventually implemented either within the institutions or submitted to federal or foundation funding sources. These funds, amounting to only slightly more than 1% of the total higher education operating funds, probably did more to stimulate ideas and improve campus morale than any other effort during 1984/85.

The success of this effort should not be overlooked. Rather, the impetus gained in 1984/85 should be continued and expanded. The Governor and General Assembly have the opportunity to provide leadership and encouragement through the appropriations process by continuing to make available funds which challenge individuals within institutions to generate new ideas and innovative programs.

Recommendation 38:

The Governor and General Assembly should continue to provide leadership and encouragement in the development of new ideas and innovative programs in the institutions by continuing to appropriate funds for such purposes in a manner such as the "10/10" funds provided during the special legislative session of 1983.

Equipment and Facilities

The State of Arkansas has an investment now worth nearly $900,000,000 in buildings and equipment at the institutions which should be protected by appropriate maintenance and repair. For example, at state-supported institutions there is a recently documented need for $13.2 million for immediate critical major maintenance. There is a need for an additional $47.6 million for other maintenance and renovation at these schools to correct existing deficiencies. Once this deferred maintenance has been done, approximately $7.5 to $10 million will be needed annually for maintenance.

Requirements for teaching high technology include investment of substantial sums in state-of-the art equipment, facilities and machinery. Further, current equipment and facilities at all institutions, including community colleges, are

in need of repair or maintenance. An example of the problem faced by higher education institutions is shown in a report published by the National Science Foundation on April 18, 1984. During 1982, only 16% of the research equipment in computer and physical sciences and engineering being used by university researchers throughout the country was "state of the art". Although still carried on inventory, 26% of the equipment was obsolete and no longer in use. The most alarming part of the report was the discovery that two-thirds of all academic research instrument systems in use during 1982 were acquired partly or entirely with federal funds. Federal funding for equipment acquisitions continues to decline and states must make every effort to provide resources necessary to bridge the gap.

Recommendation 39:

A. Immediate funding should be provided to perform critical major maintenance and other deferred maintenance already identified.

B. Adequate funding for future repair and maintenance at all institutions should be provided on a regular and recurring basis to avoid the costly buildup of deferred maintenance.

C. Funding should be made available to provide adequate resources for required equipment needs, including original purchase, repair, and maintenance.

Private Gifts and Grants

All institutions, both public and private, are judged not only by their facilities and programs but also by the quality of their students and faculty. A position of esteem among universities is difficult to achieve, and maintaining it is an even greater task. To do so requires the support of former students and friends. The state-supported institutions in Arkansas receive the major portion of their support from legislative appropriations. These institutions are discovering, however, that state appropriations alone are insufficient to meet unforeseen needs and to ensure excellence in programs. Arkansas can have "good" institutions of higher education with state appropriations but the "edge of excellence" will require additional support through private gifts and the building of endowments. When added to the base of state support, they will make the difference in attracting and retaining the most dedicated teachers and researchers, in equipping laboratories with the latest instruction and research tools, and in providing educational programs and services for the citizens of Arkansas which are among the best.

According to the Council for Financial Aid to Education, philanthropic support to higher education in the nation continued to climb in 1982/83. Private institutions received 35% of all donations while state-supported four-year institutions received 31.2%. The state-supported institutions in Arkansas have lagged behind others in attracting private gift support. Although recent years have seen great strides in establishing development programs at Arkansas institutions, continued support and encouragement must be given to these programs. Raising private gifts for any enterprise is a difficult task and requires

experienced staffing, operating support, a commitment from the executive leadership, and a major commitment from the institution as a whole to support the critical role of a development program. In addition, the state must demonstrate leadership in encouraging institutions, as well as contributors, to increase private gifts in building larger endowments for future institutional development.

As their name asserts, public institutions are indeed public and the responsibility for funding such institutions rests primarily with the public. The QHESC is cognizant of this fact and wishes in no way to diminish the level of funds appropriated for the operation of public institutions. On the contrary, the QHESC urges the allocation of even more funds than are currently being appropriated. Since the measure of quality in education can be strengthened with additional monies from the private sector, legislative appropriations should be made without regard to the amount of funds raised from private sources. A program of challenge grants should be established and apportioned among the institutions on an equitable basis; should be specific regarding the conditions which would qualify an institution to claim the challenge amount allocated to it; and should be established annually, with any amounts unclaimed by an institution in a given year being held for inclusion in the challenge grant program the following year.

Recommendation 40:

A. Institutions should establish, support, and encourage development programs to receive private gifts and build endowments in adding the edge of excellence to instruction and research programs.

B. The Governor and General Assembly should give serious consideration to establishing a state funded program of "challenge grants" to stimulate private giving to state-supported institutions in Arkansas.

Auxiliary Enterprises

Higher education budgets are divided into two sections: educational and general, and auxiliary enterprises. The educational and general portion includes those items which are directly related to the instructional, research and public service functions of the institution. Auxiliary enterprises are those operations which relate indirectly to the instructional programs. Activities considered auxiliary enterprises in Arkansas are intercollegiate athletics, residence halls, married student housing, faculty housing, food service, college student union, bookstore, student organizations, publications, student health services, and other similar activities.

Educational and general expenditures are funded primarily by two sources: legislative appropriations and student fees (tuition). Auxiliary enterprises, other than athletics, are generally paid for by those who consume the goods or services.

The budget process has assumed that auxiliary enterprises should be self-supporting. This means that the total of all auxiliary enterprises should be self-supporting, not that each enterprise would stand on its own. Generally

speaking, auxiliary enterprises other than intercollegiate athletics are nearly self-supporting. The ADHE practice has been to allow transfers from the educational and general portion of an institution's budget to the auxiliary enterprises portion: these transfers are designed to cover those auxiliaries (other than athletics) which, by their nature, are usually not self-supporting, and to cover the cost of a modest or basic intercollegiate athletic program. With the exception of UAF, no institutional intercollegiate athletic program is self-supporting.

Extensive intercollegiate athletic activities have made it difficult to finance auxiliary operations at most state institutions. In the 1982-83 school year, four-year institutions spent on the average $519,770 more than they received for intercollegiate athletics. In several instances, institutions have gone beyond the recommended allowable transfer amount. ADHE recommended an allowable transfer of $6,062,120 from the institutions' educational and general account to defray auxiliary expenses for the 1982-83 school year. Although some institutions stayed within their recommended transfer limits, an additional $1,251,833 was transferred from the educational and general budgets to the auxiliary enterprise budget for a total transfer of $7,313,953, 89% of which was attributable to the excess of expenditures over receipts in intercollegiate athletic programs. At the present time, institutions can transfer as much of their educational and general budget to the auxiliary budget as they choose.

Recommendation 41:

A. All intercollegiate athletic programs should be considered as auxiliary enterprises, and should move towards self-support.

B. Those programs not self-supporting should work through their respective athletic conferences to reduce the financial burden of intercollegiate athletic programs by such means as reducing the maximum permissible grant-in-aid awards to tuition and required fees (except in the case of need or scholastic awards) and reducing the maximum number of scholarships and out-of-state travel. Those "fringe benefits" such as segregated housing, single-room housing, and training-table operations should be limited.

C. The ADHE should continue recommending for each institution an allowable transfer from the educational and general budget to the auxiliary enterprises budget. The transfer from educational and general to auxiliary on or after July 1, 1987 should be restricted to the amount recommended by ADHE.

D. Institutions desiring to have more extensive intercollegiate athletic programs than possible through the allowable transfer should fund those programs by charging additional fees, soliciting funds from interested donors, or in other ways.

E. Institutions should report to the ADHE and their athletic conferences the yearly graduation rate for student athletes.

F. Athletic conferences should base the number of future grant-in-aid awards directly on the graduation rate.

Student Fees

Student fees for universities have traditionally been established at two levels: in-state and out-of-state. For community college students, there are three levels: in-county, out-of-county, and out-of-state. Community college fees are generally less than university fees. These two-year institutions have established low cost education as a part of their mission.

The QHESC believes that, in Arkansas, a pressing need exists to encourage more people to take advantage of opportunities offered by the state's higher education system. In order to accomplish this task, student fees must be kept as low as possible.

Recommendation 42:

A. Institutional Boards of Trustees should continue to establish student fees.

B. Student fees for vocational and technical programs should be comparable at community colleges and area vocational-technical schools. This should be accomplished by raising fees at the vocational-technical schools.

C. Student fees should not exceed 15% of the cost per student for community colleges and 20% for universities.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The improvements recommended in this report are intended for consideration and adoption by SBHE and the Boards of Trustees of the various institutions rather than by legislation. Reasons include at least the following:

1. Flexibility to meet rapidly changing conditions has been a basic precept of this report. Statutory prescriptions are generally less flexible and more difficult to change in response to changing conditions and circumstances.

2. Institutions should be encouraged to make changes resulting in even higher quality than the recommendations made here. Creativity and innovation are less likely to occur in response to legislative mandates.

There are a few situations, specified in Recommendation 43, where legislation is necessary and desirable.

Recommendation 43:

A. This report should be adopted by the SBHE with a strong recommendation to the institutional Boards of Trustees that they promptly adopt and implement these recommendations at their particular institutions.

B. The institutions should submit an annual report to the SBHE by November 1, 1985, and annually thereafter, concerning actions taken in response to this report. The SBHE should submit a report on the state of higher education in Arkansas to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1, 1987, and biennially thereafter.

C. The General Assembly and Governor should secure the passage of legislation to accomplish the following:

1. Appropriation of funds in a manner and in amounts sufficient to accomplish the improvements in quality recommended in this report.

2. Restoration of the position of Director of ADHE to a non-political office whose holder is selected by and serves at the pleasure of the SBHE.

3. Clarification and/or strengthening of existing legislation to make certain the authority of the SBHE to perform the duties and functions recommended in this report.

4. Accomplishing the merger of two-year colleges and vocational-technical schools.

5. Authorizing establishment of the Arkansas Alumni Fellows program.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Relationship to other Groups and Committees

Recommendation 1:

The State Board of Education, the Governor, and the General Assembly should support, defend, and strengthen the standards for elementary and secondary schools adopted on recommendation of the Education Standards Committee. Adherence to those standards is essential to the improvement of higher education in Arkansas.

Recommendation 2:

The boards of trustees, boards of visitors, administrators, and faculties of the institutions should lead the way in establishing an ongoing partnership including government, private sector leaders, and all levels of education that can and will assess the strengths of the state or a given area of the state, and provide a basis and a blueprint for responsiveness of the institutions to those needs.

GOVERNANCE AND ORGANIZATION

Governance and Organization

Recommendation 3:

A. Each institution should continue to have its own board of trustees, selected as now provided by law. Local decision-making machinery should be further strengthened, not weakened.

B. The General Assembly should appoint a committee comprising representatives of the institutions and their boards, the SBHE, relevant state agencies or departments, and the General Assembly for the purpose of developing a clear policy statement of the division between decisions which should be made at the institutional level and those in which a central authority should be involved. That committee should also recommend to the General Assembly legislation, if any, needed to implement the policy statement. All public policy makers should then unite in insisting that this statement prevails when questions arise in the future.

C. As the overall goals and needs of the State of Arkansas are identified, clarified, and articulated, the State Board of Higher Education, in conjunction with the institutions. should be given additional responsibility in the areas of quality assurance, establishment of institutional role and scope and/or mission statements, reduction in inappropriate and unnecessary duplication of new and existing programs, and assuring that the critical needs of institutions are addressed.

D. The statutes should be changed so that the Director of the ADHE is appointed by the SBHE and serves at its pleasure.

E. In selecting appointees to higher education boards and commissions. the Governor and members of the Senate should continue to give primary consideration to the qualifications of the individuals with negative consideration given to political ambitions or single-purpose objectives.

The Number and Scope of Institutions

Recommendation 4:

A. If the college-going rate is raised as it should be, no further consideration need be given to eliminating institutions. Rather, all attention should be directed toward more clearly defining unique roles, scopes, and missions for the existing institutions. Serious consideration should not be given in the near future. however. to establishing any more colleges anywhere in the state.

B. There should be an early resolution to the status of the Graduate Institute of Technology (GIT) through the existing advisory structure.

C. Where two-year institutions and vocational-technical schools exist in the same area, the two should be combined into one comprehensive institution.

CURRICULUM AND STUDENTS

Admission of Students to Colleges and Universities

Recommendation 5:

The higher admissions standards adopted by the SBHE in February, 1984, should be adopted by all four-year institutions not later than August, 1985. (These standards are attached as appendix A.)

Recommendation 6:

An open door policy should be continued for admission to vocational or occupational courses or programs.

Recommendation 7:

A. All students should be assessed, using the ACT or SAT and various supplementary examinations, to determine whether and to what extent remediation is required.

B. Beginning in 1986, all students with a composite score below 16 on the ACT, or equivalent, should be assigned to academic skill development activities in those areas that have been determined to be weak. Beginning in 1988, the composite score should be raised to 18.

C. Regardless of the composite test score, appropriate skill development activities should be made available where assessment identifies specific areas of weakness.

Conditional Admission and Non-Traditional Students

Recommendation 8:

A. Institutions should have an admission classification designed to allow students to enroll for short-term programs which do not lead to degrees.

B. Students who seek a college education following an extended lapse of time since high school graduation or who seek to change from non-degree to degree-seeking status, whether as first time enrollees, re-enrollees in the same institution or by transfer from another institution, should not be assessed exclusively on the basis of admission requirements applicable to traditional college students, but rather on the basis of other appropriate criteria.

Retention of Students in Colleges and Universities

Recommendation 9:

A. Each institution should develop a comprehensive retention program that includes close attention to advising for proper academic placement and counseling for all students throughout their enrollment in the institution.

B. Although all students should receive regular attention from advisors, particular attention should be directed toward those students who may be having personal or academic difficulty. Faculty or other advisors selected to deal with such problems should receive intensive training, be required to work closely

with the campus counseling center, and be recognized for their increased responsibility in salary, promotion, and tenure decisions.

C. The retention program should include close contact with parents or guardians, dissemination of information about the federal Family Rights and Privacy Act (Buckley Amendment), and provision of forms to the parents to enable them to obtain the student's signature permitting the institution to release copies of grade and progress reports.

General Education Curriculum

Recommendation 10:

A. For all students receiving baccalaureate degrees, a basic core general education curriculum should be established, including at least the following 29 semester hours (or higher level courses) which should be completed by students within the first 60 semester hours earned:

English Composition and Grammar	6 hours
Oral Communication	3 hours
Western or World Civilization	6 hours
American Government or History	3 hours
Life Sciences (with laboratory)	4 hours
Physical Sciences (with laboratory)	4 hours
College Algebra or General Mathematics	3 hours
Basic Core Curriculum Total	29 hours

The minimum core curriculum described above is only a minimum, a floor below which institutions should not go. Institutions are encouraged to take every opportunity to prescribe core curricula of greater quantity, or quality, or both. In addition, students should be permitted to satisfy the specified course requirements, when appropriate, by established standardized testing procedures.

B. A divisional elective general education curriculum should be established consisting of the following 15 semester hours:

Literature	3 hours
Social Sciences (From department other than history, such as sociology, psychology, economics, geography, anthropology, or political science)	3 hours
Humanities and Fine Arts (From at least two different areas including art, music, philosophy, or drama)	6 hours
Foreign Language (or successful passage of proficiency examination)	3 hours
Divisional Elective Curriculum Total	15 hours

Minimum Course Content.

Recommendation 11:

A. The ADHE should appoint a faculty committee to write a guide of minimum principles and concepts to be included in each course in the basic core general education curriculum to be used by each institution in establishing the minimum elements of each course specified. The committee for each course should include a representative from the department responsible for that course in each institution.

B. Members of the appointed committees should serve specified terms and meet periodically to review, revise, and update the guides.

Evaluation.

Recommendation 12:

A. The ADHE should appoint a committee, widely representative of all institutions, to decide upon an assessment to be made of all students with respect to skills in reading, effective oral and written communication, and mathematics, which the basic core general education requirements are intended to provide.

B. The test selected should be given to students in each institution, including graduates from two-year institutions who seek to enroll in four-year institutions. The test should be taken after completion of the basic core general education curriculum courses and prior to the completion of 75 semester credit hours.

C. For the first four years (academic years 1986-87 through 1989-90), the test results should be used to evaluate and improve the general education curriculum at each institution. Beginning with academic year 1990-91, successful completion of the test with a score prescribed by the committee should be required for a student to take semester credit hours beyond 75. A student with a failing grade should be given specific academic advice and counseling regarding steps that should be taken remedy the student's deficiencies. The student may retake the test on one or more occasions.

Transfer of Credits

Recommendation 13:

A. The 44 semester credit hours recommended for the baccalaureate degree in the basic core general education curriculum and the divisional elective general education curriculum should transfer freely among all institutions.

B. Curriculum transfer agreements similar to those now existing among some institutions in certain curricular areas should be adopted by all institutions and additional agreements should be developed with respect to other common baccalaureate degree majors.

Accreditation

Recommendation 14:

Institutions should retain regional accreditation, seek specialized accreditation for programs which have accrediting agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), reflect in planning documents specific steps and timetables for moving toward accreditation status, and have on file documents which reflect that relevant programs meet or exceed minimum standards for accreditation by specialized accrediting agencies.

Academic Program Review

New programs.

Recommendation 15:

A. The current process for reviewing proposals for new academic programs by the State Board of Higher Education should be continued.

B. The document entitled Criteria and Procedures for Preparing New Proposals, Revised 1975, should be retained for use in essentially its present form. The staff of the ADHE and the chief academic officers at the various institutions should review the document and jointly determine appropriate editorial changes and clarification of definitions of programs requiring formal submission and those requiring letters of notification.

Existing programs.

Recommendation 16:

A. The ADHE, in consultation with the institutions, should establish criteria for making judgments with respect to the maintenance, strengthening, elimination, or merger of existing academic programs and arrange for statewide reviews of all academic fields at least once each five years.

B. The program reviews should be conducted by panels of non-resident, impartial, and respected faculty members, administrators, and/or other authorities in the field, working with a review team established at each institution.

C. Law and engineering should be given first priority in the review process.

D. Funding should be made available annually to the ADHE for conducting existing academic program reviews so that such reviews may take into account both quality and quantity factors.

On-going institutional curricular review.

Recommendation 17:

Institutions should continuously evaluate their curricular and course content to insure that they are current and relevant. When appropriate, these evaluations should include lay or non-academic advisors who have expertise or experience in the field.

Teacher Education

Recommendation 18:

A. The university presidents and chancellors should take an active role in promoting and facilitating the sharing of responsibility and involvement by other appropriate divisions of the institution in teacher education. A Teacher Education Committee should be established at each institution composed jointly of persons representing the subject matter content disciplines and of persons representing teacher education. The purpose of the committee would be to recommend curriculum content and the general process of educating prospective teachers.

B. The foundation of all teacher education programs should be a strong general education program. All teacher education majors should take, as a minimum, the same general education courses recommended for all baccalaureate degree programs.

C. The education courses, especially for elementary education majors, should be revised to recognize the content of the recommended general education courses so that the professional education content is taught only at the upper level.

D. At the freshman and sophomore levels, teacher education majors should experience only a brief introduction to teacher education, exposure to teaching situations through observation and experience, and testing for aptitude and ability to become a teacher.

E. Specialization (certification) requirements and curricula for teacher education candidates should be carefully reviewed to determine whether there should be less or different emphases on methods and techniques. All teaching candidates should

pursue in-depth study in one field sufficient to pursue graduate study. A full major in a discipline should be required of secondary teaching candidates.

F. Credit for student teaching experiences should be commensurate with the time spent in supervised classroom teaching. Requiring a full semester of student teaching should be given a high priority within the teacher education program. All student teaching experiences should be supervised by master teachers who are selected, trained, and appropriately compensated for that service.

G. Pre-packaged teacher training programs (such as the Program for Effective Teaching, Assertive Discipline, etc.), when used, should be in place of and not in addition to existing methods course hours in the pre-service curriculum; if such programs do not duplicate existing course content, appropriate credit hours should be awarded.

H. In order to identify and eliminate weaknesses, all teacher education candidates entering schools of education should be evaluated for competency in written and oral communications not later than the junior year.

I. Instruction in basic school law, including individual and institutional liability, responsibility and duty, should be incorporated into undergraduate teacher education programs.

J. Classroom teachers should be encouraged through the certification process to complete masters degrees. Credit on the salary scale should not be given to classroom teachers for masters degrees obtained after July 1, 1987 which are not related to the area being taught. In no case should credit be given for a masters degree if granted by a program not then accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting association.

K. All professional staff in college programs of teacher education should have a substantial teaching or other appropriate experience (e.g., 120 hours) in a primary or secondary school setting at least every four years.

L. All initial teacher certifications should be provisional; permanent certification should be granted only after a specified provisional period and upon the recommendation of a team consisting of a public school administrator, a public school master teacher, and a college or university faculty member.

M. All teaching candidates should pass the basic core general education curriculum test or a state-validated basic skills test prior to admission to teacher education programs.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

Faculty Preparation and Qualifications

Recommendation 19:

A. Institutions should examine the composition of their faculties annually to ensure that they support the mission of the institution. When an institution finds a mismatch, it should take immediate steps to alleviate the problem. This may involve recruitment or it may involve an institution's allocation of funds to support the existing faculty's pursuit of the skills appropriate to the institution's needs.

B. All four-year colleges and universities should continue to increase the number of faculty members holding terminal degrees, normally the doctorate, with a 10-year goal of 80% for doctoral institutions, 70% for masters institutions, and 60% for baccalaureate institutions.

Annual Evaluation

Recommendation 20:

A. Four-year institutions should continue their practice of differentially rewarding each year those faculty whose academic merit assist the institution in achieving the goals of higher education - teaching, research, and service. Such institutions should develop, by 1989, an annual compensation recommendation system based completely on merit.

B. Two-year institutions should continue their contract renewal evaluation and, by 1989, implement a system with annual salary recommendations based on a merit component and a salary schedule component.

C. Institutions should continually monitor their evaluation systems to ensure that they promote and reward those areas of faculty performance which maximize the specific stated goals and missions of such institutions.

D. Institutions should utilize classroom evaluations from students, from colleagues, and from supervisors. In addition to the student evaluations usually done, all classroom instructors should receive, at least once each semester, class visitation from a team composed of peers and a departmental chairperson or other appropriate supervisory staff.

E. Each institution should develop a formal system for evaluating administrative and other non-faculty personnel. This system should be tailored to the individual needs and missions of each institution but should, at a minimum, require that

annual salary recommendations be based on the results of a formal evaluation done in accordance with publicly established guidelines and criteriA. As in the case of the faculty evaluations, broad input, including faculty, other administrators, and students where appropriate, should be sought in this annual evaluation system.

Promotion

Recommendation 21:

A. Since the promotion procedure is one of the most important elements in gaining and maintaining a quality educational experience for Arkansas students, all four-year institutions should maintain and continually monitor the quality of their promotion evaluation procedures.

B. Self-study and self-review are critical to long term quality. All four-year schools should involve the broadest participation in the evaluation process. Students, colleagues, and supervisors can all provide important data to assist in this review.

C. If the institutions are to seek salary parity with comparable regional or national institutions, it is incumbent on them to demonstrate parity in the quality of their faculty and of their programs. Each four-year college should develop a list of peer institutions similar in goals, objectives, and overall missions, and routinely send selected portions of each faculty member's promotion documentation for outside review and comment.

D. The four-year institutions should be encouraged to select as reviewers other institutions that have stronger programs and may, therefore, serve as role models in gradually increasing faculty expectations and aspirations. Through outside review, the institutions will be able to systematically monitor their standards in comparison with regional and national peer institutions and better demonstrate the high quality of the educational experience.

E. Two-year colleges should form a statewide task force to examine alternate ways of providing long term evaluation of their faculty. This task force should make recommendations to ADHE for a system of periodic reviews, analogous to the system used for promotion review in the four-year schools. The purpose of this review would be to provide two-year colleges with procedures whereby senior faculty could be given the opportunity to receive substantial step salary increases every five to seven years in addition to their annual salary increments.

F. Because of the different missions of the two-year colleges, the review procedure and criteria may differ substantially from the promotion procedures used in four-year schools. However different the procedures may be, they should allow the two-year colleges to better demonstrate and reward the quality of their professional faculty and staff.

Tenure

Recommendation 22:

A. In addition to the annual faculty evaluation, tenure-granting institutions should develop policies and procedures for longer term evaluation of tenured members of their faculties. Evaluation periods of five to seven years would allow institutions to demonstrate their concern for accountability as well as provide an opportunity to reward senior faculty. The periodic reviews should be directed toward allowing faculty members to demonstrate the quality of their records but, more importantly, to be an opportunity for them to outline multi-year individual development plans which will promote growth across the entire faculty.

B. As a result of these reviews, institutions should award special merit salary increases, analogous to raises which accompany promotions, to outstanding faculty. These periodic evaluations could serve as a mechanism whereby senior faculty salaries could, over time, remain in a more favorable position relative to the job market, particularly for outstanding faculty.

Faculty-and Administration-Salaries

Recommendation 23:

A. A plan should be established, and funding provided, to increase the average faculty salary at all institutions with the goal of attaining parity with national averages by the 1990/91 academic year. An interim goal should be parity with the SREB states no later than the 1986/87 academic year.

B. The plan should recognize that the greatest need exists at the higher faculty ranks. The increments in meeting national and SREB salary averages should be implemented in addition to the yearly increments generally built into the budget.

Administration salaries.

Recommendation 24:

Salaries should be set for all administrative personnel at levels competitive with national average salaries at comparable institutions.

Faculty and Staff Development

Recommendation 25:

A. Over the next two years each institution should formally examine its current level of faculty and staff development effort and determine if that level is sufficient to meet the future demands given the demographic and substantive composition of the faculty. This examination, which should have faculty, administrative, and student input, should result in an institutional policy which specifies the percent of institutional resources to be expended on such development and the proportion of staff who will be affected over a five-year period. Once developed, this plan should be reexamined and revised every five years.

B. Every faculty and staff member in every institution should have a professional development plan, individually tailored in terms of the goals and resources of the college and the scholarly needs of the individual involved. Such plans should be developed in consultation with appropriate college officials and should form the basis for faculty and staff evaluation.

Personnel Turnover

Recommendation 26:

Beginning with the 1984-85 academic year, all institutions should routinely conduct exit interviews for all staff resigning from faculty or administrative positions. At a minimum, the interview should determine the reason for the resignation, the name of the institution and the area to which the individual is moving, the type of new employment, and, if available, the entry level salary. A summary report of the results of these interviews should be submitted by each President or Chancellor to the ADHE by September 15 of each year.

Faculty Workload

Recommendation 27:

A. Since teaching is the foremost function of any educational institution, all Arkansas students should have the opportunity to study under the best scholars available. Therefore, all graduate faculty should also be assigned to teach lower and upper division undergraduate courses.

B. Workloads should specifically include assignments for the advising function. If students are to be retained, they must receive adequate academic as well as career advising. Further, institutions should develop formal mechanisms to reward outstanding advisors.

C. Some research and/or scholarly activity should be a part of all faculty workloads at four-year institutions. In institutions with graduate programs, the research assignment may be directed toward basic or applied research consistent with the mission of the institution, while in other institutions the scholarly activity may be directed toward increasing a faculty member's knowledge in support of his/her teaching.

D. Institutions should, for some proportion of their faculty, include a formal community service assignment in the annual workload. If service is properly recognized and rewarded, it will promote an increasing responsiveness of educational institutions to the needs of the state and the local community.

E. Administrators should develop a means of regular contact with students, including, but not limited to, such means as: teaching (if at all possible), working with student groups, sponsoring student organizations, advising, and including students on advisory bodies reporting to them.

Part-Time Instruction and Graduate Assistants

Recommendation 28:

A. Each institution should develop a comprehensive method of selecting and evaluating part-time and graduate assistant personnel. Appropriate direction and supervision are necessary to ensure that students receive a high quality classroom experience. Graduate assistants being utilized as instructors should be observed in the classroom by supervising staff a minimum of four times each semester; part-time instructors should be observed at least once each semester. It is each institution's responsibility to ensure that no full-time student has a majority of any semester's hours taught by other than full-time personnel.

B. Institutions should develop a plan which provides for the use of part-time faculty primarily for the purpose of providing selected expertise otherwise unavailable and which limits the use of such persons for merely "covering" courses in high demand disciplines.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Employment

Recommendation 29:

Because of the paucity of blacks in the pool of candidates available to colleges and universities, Arkansas should adopt a Arkansas higher education system. This plan should include a

partnership of institutions with the General Assembly in an Arkansas Doctoral Fellow Program. Candidates for this program should come from two sources - black faculty and administrators currently employed in Arkansas institutions and black students graduating from Arkansas institutions with baccalaureate or masters degrees.

Faculty/Administrator and Arkansas Alumni Fellows

Recommendation 30:

The General Assembly should set aside a special fund to reimburse participating institutions for 50% of the cost of the fellowship programs. These funds should be used to partially reimburse institutions for the costs involved in replacing faculty and administrators while on leave to complete their doctoral studies.

Enrollment

Recommendation 31:

A. The ADHE should establish and be funded to maintain an Educational Opportunities Information Center responsible for the publication and dissemination of all statewide recruitment materials and for the coordination of institutional efforts to increase generally the college-going rate of Arkansas citizens.

B. Undergraduate

Funds should be provided state institutions to enable them to grant minority presence scholarships. Students at a given institution who rank in the top 40% of their high school graduating classes should be awarded aid which, when combined with any other institutional scholarships, would not exceed the amount of tuition and fees. The minority presence scholarships should be renewable for four years if the student's grade point average remains above 2.8. Scholarships should be restricted to Arkansas residents attending state-supported institutions of higher education in Arkansas.

C. Masters

Scholarships should be provided directly to graduate students who attend graduate programs at state-supported institutions in Arkansas in which the students are in the racial minority. Scholarships should be based on academic qualifications, in the amount of tuition and fees, and renewable for one additional year.

D. Doctoral, Law, and Medicine

Scholarships should be provided to selected minority presence graduate scholars who are Arkansas residents to allow them to pursue studies at state-supported institutions in Arkansas in the fields of law and medicine, and for the doctorate in fields in which black participation has been historically low, e.g., engineering and physical sciences. Each scholarship should provide an annual stipend plus tuition and fees, up to three years for the doctorate and law and four years for medicine.

E. Funds should be provided to ADHE to be apportioned annually for the following year.

RESOURCES AND GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS

Higher Education as a Priority in State Financial Resources

Recommendation 32:

The General Assembly should avoid reducing the priority on higher education in the allocation of general revenues in times of declining tax collections, and be aggressive in increasing the state's investment in higher education as circumstances permit.

Higher Education Budget Process

Recommendation 33:

The formula approach to appropriation requests is reasonable, thorough and equitable, and should be continued. Consideration of Justification Items, those institutional needs not accommodated by the various formulas, should also be continued. Appropriations should continue to be made to institutions in the same proportion as the final recommendations of the SBHE.

Management Responsibility and Flexibility

Recommendation 34:

A. Administrators should be given both the responsibility and the authority to successfully manage their institutions with additional flexibility in purchasing, personnel, and other matters having to do with daily institutional management.

B. Methods should be found for directing appropriated funds to the various institutions in a manner which provides incentives and rewards for good management practices.

Institutions should be permitted, within reasonable limits, to transfer funds from one line item in the appropriations act to another.

C. Modifications should be made in the State Employees Classification and Pay Plan to provide much-needed flexibility. For example, permission should be granted to hire entry level personnel at higher steps without state agency approval, to give experience credit for employment outside state government, and to recognize and reward outstanding employees on the basis of merit.

D. In providing greater flexibility in attracting and retaining the highest quality faculty and administrative staff, the line item maximum regulations in appropriation acts should be changed to include a maximum average for each faculty rank and administrative category rather than the present maximum for any one individual within a category.

Libraries

Recommendation 35:

A. Library holdings should be improved in state colleges and universities. Special funding should be made available to assist the institutional libraries in reaching the minimum standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Specific holdings should, however, match the mission of each institution.

B. Each institution's normal operating budget should provide for a maintenance of effort, not to be offset or replaced by any supplemental funding, to further improve libraries.

C. A special incentive matching fund should be set up and become part of the library fund formulas to be allocated to those institutions making the most progress toward meeting and exceeding the minimum library standards.

D. The General Assembly should establish an information-technology task force to conduct a feasibility study of a state-wide, multi-type library networking system involving cooperation among academic, public school, and other information agencies. The task force should focus on information holdings with special attention to document delivery, networking, access to national data bases and other services that will link our citizens with what they want to know, through the widest means possible.

Research and Service

Research.

Recommendation 36:

A. While the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences should adopt institution-wide objectives of increased activity in basic research, all four-year institutions should adopt institution-wide objectives of increased activity in research by faculty members.

B. At all four-year institutions, research involvement should be recognized as an element in promotion, tenure, and salary increases, but always secondary to the instructional obligation.

Public service.

Recommendation 37:

All institutions, including two-year colleges, should put greater emphasis on the public service role. Public service programs should be carefully defined within the resources available to institutions. Public service functions performed by faculty members under the auspices of the institutions should be recognized in promotion, tenure, and salary decisions.

Creativity and Innovation

Recommendation 38:

The Governor and General Assembly should continue to provide leadership and encouragement in the development of new ideas and innovative programs in the institutions by continuing to appropriate funds for such purposes in a manner such as the "10/10" funds provided during the special legislative session of 1983.

Equipment and Facilities

Recommendation 39:

A. Immediate funding should be provided to perform critical major maintenance and other deferred maintenance already identified.

B. Adequate funding for future repair and maintenance at all institutions should be provided on a regular and recurring basis to avoid the costly buildup of deferred maintenance.

C. Funding should be made available to provide adequate resources for required equipment needs, including original purchase, repair, and maintenance.

Private Gifts and Grants

Recommendation 40:

A. Institutions should establish, support, and encourage development programs to receive private gifts and build endowments in adding the edge of excellence to instruction and research programs.

B. The Governor and General Assembly should give serious consideration to establishing a state funded program of "challenge grants" to stimulate private giving to state-supported institutions in Arkansas.

Auxiliary Enterprises

Recommendation 41:

A. All intercollegiate athletic programs should be considered as auxiliary enterprises, and should move towards self-support.

B. Those programs not self-supporting should work through their respective athletic conferences to reduce the financial burden of intercollegiate athletic programs by such means as reducing the maximum permissible grant-in-aid awards to tuition and required fees (except in the case of need or scholastic awards) and reducing the maximum number of scholarships and out-of-state travel. Those "fringe benefits" such as segregated housing, single-room housing, and training-table operations should be limited.

C. The ADHE should continue recommending for each institution an allowable transfer from the educational and general budget to the auxiliary enterprises budget. The transfer from educational and general to auxiliary on or after July 1, 1987 should be restricted to the amount recommended by ADHE.

D. Institutions desiring to have more extensive intercollegiate athletic programs than possible through the allowable transfer should fund those programs by charging additional fees, soliciting funds from interested donors, or in other ways.

E. Institutions should report to the ADHE and their athletic conferences the yearly graduation rate for student athletes.

F. Athletic conferences should base the number of future grant-in-aid awards directly on the graduation rate.

Student Fees

Recommendation 42:

A. Institutional Boards of Trustees should continue to establish student fees.

B. Student fees for vocational and technical programs should be comparable at community colleges and area vocational-technical schools. This should be accomplished by raising fees at the vocational-technical schools.

C. Student fees should not exceed 15% of the cost per student for community colleges and 20% for universities.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 43:

A. This report should be adopted by the SBHE with a strong recommendation to the institutional Boards of Trustees that they promptly adopt and implement these recommendations at their particular institutions.

B. The institutions should submit an annual report to the SBHE by November 1, 1985, and annually thereafter, concerning actions taken in response to this report. The SBHE should submit a report on the state of higher education in Arkansas to the Governor and General Assembly by January 1, 1987, and biennially thereafter.

C. The General Assembly and Governor should secure the passage of legislation to accomplish the following:

1. Appropriation of funds in a manner and in amounts sufficient to accomplish the improvements in quality recommended in this report.

2. Restoration of the position of Director of ADHE to a non-political office whose holder is selected by and serves at the pleasure of the SBHE.

3. Clarification and/or strengthening of existing legislation to make certain the authority of the SBHE to perform the duties and functions recommended in this report.

4. Accomplishing the merger of two-year colleges and vocational-technical schools.

5. Authorizing establishment of the Arkansas Alumni Fellows program.

APPENDIX A

Recommendations
Task Force on Admissions and Academic Standards
September 7, 1983

The recommendation of admissions standards for Arkansas colleges and universities suggests a uniform and high-level academic foundation upon which postsecondary institutions may base their curricula. While Arkansas needs to improve the quality and level of instruction throughout its educational system, it also needs greater numbers of college educated citizens. Adoption of the recommended admissions standards should not be construed, therefore, as an attempt to reduce the percentage of Arkansans attending institutions of higher education. These recommendations represent an effort to assure better high school and college programs, to provide more opportunity for students wishing to complete college, and to encourage greater proportions of Arkansans to attend college.

The statement of college admission requirements which follows is intended to apply only to students moving directly from high school to state colleges and universities as full-time students working toward baccalaureate degrees.

For two-year institutions, open admissions should be maintained, but the college transfer program should assume the same levels of high school preparation required for admission to universities and senior colleges. Two-year college students in academic transfer programs who have not taken the high school courses recommended for college admission should take developmental courses which provide the expected background prior to taking the college course(s) in which they have deficiencies. As a general rule, the developmental courses will not apply toward baccalaureate degree requirements.

Summary of 1990 Required Units:

English - Four units

Natural Science - Two units chosen from two of the following: biology, chemistry, or physics

Mathematics - Two units, including algebra I and geometry

Social Studies - Three units, including one of American history, one of world history, and at least one half of civics or American government

Foreign Language - Two units in one foreign language

Introduction to Computer Science - One half unit

Total - 13.5 units

Interpretive Comments

1. The 4 units of English required should include emphasis on writing skills sufficient to provide each student entering college with basic competency in composition and grammar.

2. The social studies requirement provides high schools the alternative of either a full unit or a half unit of civics or American government.

3. The half unit requirement for introduction to computer science is intended to provide the student a greater background in computer science than minimal computer literacy which may be provided in pre-high school instruction.

4. A higher level course in any subject matter area may be substituted for the requirement of a specific course in that same subject matter area. For example, a student in an advanced math sequence who takes algebra I in the eighth grade in order to take more advanced math courses could substitute algebra II for the algebra I requirement.

5. Requirements in a particular course may be met through demonstrated competency in that course.

Recommendations Regarding Collegiate Academic Standards and Programs

1. Colleges and universities should recognize the need for curricular revision inherent in the changes in preparation of incoming students which should occur as the result of these recommendations and other current discussions for improvements in education in Arkansas. Institutions of higher education should monitor the changes in high school curricula and student preparation and reflect these changes in college curricula.

2. Institutions of higher education should consider joint utilization of a single nationally standardized entrance examination. The results of such an examination should be used for improved student placement at the colleges and routine reports to secondary schools on their graduates' test scores and college success.

3. Colleges and universities should review their student admission, testing, placement and counseling systems and initiate necessary change in order to assure that students are appropriately counseled and placed in individual courses.

4. Individual institutions of higher education should review and define or redefine the general education component of their baccalaureate degrees. Within the general education component, the necessary student competencies in the various subject matter areas should be identified and institutions should require that students demonstrate those competencies before completion of the general education component.

5. Colleges and universities should administer nationally standardized tests to graduating students in the various programs and departments and utilize the results to evaluate the effectiveness of college instructional programs.

6. It is recommended that colleges and universities individually review their grading practices and policies on granting various awards and honors in order that grades and awards given clearly and fairly represent student accomplishment.

7. While the improvement in student academic backgrounds which should result from these recommendations and other improvement activities may reduce the need for remedial instruction in the future, colleges and universities should not prematurely eliminate remedial activities. Colleges and universities should continually review high school curricula and entering student academic qualifications and make appropriate curricular adjustments in remedial programs.

8. Beginning in the summer of 1987, the effective date for the implementation of the anticipated elementary and secondary school accreditation standards, ADHE should assemble a second task force on college admissions and academic standards to review the situation and make recommendations in light of changes that have occurred.

PHASING OF REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION, EFFECTIVE WITH FALL OF THE YEAR INDICATED

Subject Field	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
English	4 units	4, same	4, same	4, same	4, same	4, same
Natural Science	2 units	2 units, including one from biology chemistry, or physics	2, same	2 units, chosen from biology, chemistry, or physics	2, same	2, same
Mathematics	2 units, including algebra I	2 units, including algebra I and geometry	2, same	2, same	2, same	2, same
Social Studies	2 units, including 1 in American history and/or civics or Amer. government	2 units, chosen from American history, world history, and civics or Amer. government	3 units, including American history, world history, and civics or Amer. government	3, same	3, same	3, same
Foreign Language	none	none	none	none	1 unit	2 units from one language
Intro. to Computer Science	none	none	none	0.5 unit	0.5, same	0.5, same
TOTAL REQUIRED UNITS	10 units	10 units	11 units	11.5 units	12.5 units	13.5 units